



LS70.2
CC
1878

38798

AUTHOR

Church Congress

TITLE

Report of the proceedings

DATE DUE

BORROWER'S NAME

MAY 6 '68

DENNIS DUFALLA 8456000
410 HEARST M.B.
UC BERK. X3804

CBGTU

Library of the
Church Divinity School
of the Pacific

THE
OFFICIAL REPORT
OF THE
EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
CHURCH CONGRESS,
HELD AT
SHEFFIELD, 1878.



EDITED BY THE HONORARY SECRETARIES TO THE CONGRESS.

SHEFFIELD:
PRINTED & PUBLISHED BY PAWSON & BRAILSFORD,
CHURCH GATES, AND BRITANNIA PRINTING WORKS, MULBERRY STREET.
LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL & CO.,
STATIONERS' HALL COURT.

1879.



PREFACE.

AS the full particulars of each meeting are here recorded, very few prefatory remarks are needed beyond the putting on record the thanks of the Committee to those readers and speakers who kindly consented, at their request, to undertake to prepare papers and speeches, and for the labour and care which they must evidently have bestowed upon them, and also to express the pleasure of the Committee with the manner in which the debates were conducted, and with the spirit which pervaded all the meetings of the Congress.

The thanks of those who had the conduct of the arrangements are especially due to His Grace the Lord Archbishop of York for the advice and counsel which he always so readily gave on all occasions, and for his attendance, often at considerable personal inconvenience, at all the more important meetings of Committee ; and also to the Vicar of Sheffield for his kindness in aiding them in all their difficulties, and for placing at their disposal a room at the Vicarage for all Congress meetings, and where they could transact the necessary business.

Every endeavour has been made to render this Report a faithful record of the eighteenth Church Congress; and our thanks are specially due to the Publishers for the able way in which they have managed the Report, as well as for their hearty co-operation in the work of the Congress generally.

It is impossible to send this Report forth to the world without expressing gratitude to the people of Sheffield and the neighbourhood, of all shades of opinion, for their hearty reception of the Church Congress; nor can we allow it to go forth without expressing a hope that the meeting held in October, 1878, may through Divine help be the means of increasing the spread of Truth, Love, and Faith, not only in Sheffield but through the length and breadth of the country.

C. SISUM WRIGHT,	} HON. SECS.,
S. ROBERTS, JUN.,	
W. MOORE EDE,	
ARTHUR JACKSON,	
	CHURCH CONGRESS,
	1878.

FEBRUARY, 1879.

CHURCH CONGRESS, SHEFFIELD, 1878.

BALANCE SHEET.

Dr.		£	s.	d.	Cr.	£	s.	d.
To	2257 Full Tickets, at 6s....	...	...	0	By Hire of Rooms...	...	...	249 8 6
"	235 Tickets for the Platform at the Working-Men's Special Meeting, at 2s. 6d. ...	...	...	6	" Furnishing and Fittings...	...	...	103 3 9
"	Sale of Day and Evening Tickets ...	101	7	0	" Printing and Advertising ...	...	...	319 3 11
"	Bank Interest ...	1	11	0	" Cost of Conversation ...	...	...	131 7 0
"	Call of 2s. 6d. in the £ upon the Guarantee Fund ...	217	5	0	" Clerks, Messengers, &c....	...	...	73 9 0
					" Postage ...	...	...	23 13 5
					" Sundries ...	...	...	30 3 0
					" Bank Commission ...	...	...	0 18 4
					" 200 Copies of Report ...	...	...	70 0 0
					" Balance to hand over to the " Sheffield Church Conference" Funds ...	...	...	15 5 7
					£1016 12 6			

THOS. R. GAINSFORD,

Hon. Treasurer.

February, 1879.

INDEX.

ALL the Meetings of the Congress were held in the ALBERT HALL except those marked with an asterisk (*) which were held in the CUTLERS' HALL.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 1st.

	PAGE.
SERMON, by the Bishop of Ripon	3
INAUGURAL ADDRESS, by His Grace the President ..	15
FOREIGN AND COLONIAL MISSIONS :—	
Chairman :—His Grace the President.	
PAPERS :—Bishop of Pennsylvania	22
Rev. G. F. Maclear, D.D...	29
Rev. T. Green	34
ADDRESSES :—Bishop of Capetown	39
Rev. J. F. Fenn	42
Rev. Canon Bailey, D.D. ..	44
DISCUSSION :—Rev. T. P. Hughes	46
Bishop Ryan	47
MODERN DOUBTS AND DIFFICULTIES :—	
Chairman :—His Grace the President.	
PAPERS :—Rev. Professor Watkins	48
Rev. Prof. Stanley Leathes, D.D.	55
Rev. Robinson Thornton, D.D.	61
ADDRESSES :—Rev. Brownlow Maitland	67
Rev. J. B. Lowe, D.D. ..	70
DISCUSSION :—Dean of Manchester	74
Rev. John W. Bardsley ..	76
Rev. Prebendary Clark ..	78
Rev. Canon Gover	80
Rev. R. B. Girdlestone ..	81
*FREE AND OPEN CHURCHES :—	
Chairman :—Bishop of Carlisle.	
PAPERS :—Mr. Bernard Wake ..	84
Rev. W. Milton	90

	PAGE.
ADDRESSES :—The Right Hon. the Earl of Wharncliffe..	95
Rev. W. Lefroy	97
Mr. B. Fletcher	99
DISCUSSION :—Mr. T. Collins ..	102
Bishop Perry	104
The Rt. Hon. Earl Nelson	105
Rev. Canon Scott	106
Mr. Spencer Stanhope, M.P.	108
Rev. Canon Hoare.. ..	109
Mr. E. Herford, J.P. ..	110
Rev. J. B. Pearson.. ..	111
Mr. H. Byron Reed	112
Bishop of Dunedin.. ..	113
Dean of Manchester	114
The Chairman	115

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 2nd.

COMPREHENSIVENESS IN THE NATIONAL CHURCH :—	
Chairman :—His Grace the President.	
PAPERS :—Hon. C. L. Wood ..	116
Rev. J. Llewelyn Davies ..	122
Rev. Canon Ryle	127
ADDRESSES :—Archdeacon Hessey	133
Rev. W. Sanday, D.D. ..	138
Rev. Gilbert S. Karney ..	140
DISCUSSION :—The Rt. Hon. Earl Nelson	142
Mr. C. H. Lovell	143
Hon. and Rev. W. H. Fremantle	145
Mr. Thomas Layman	146
Bishop of Carlisle	148
Rev. Joseph Bardsley	148
His Grace the President ..	151

THE CHURCH'S WORK :—

Chairman :—Bishop of St. David's.	
PAPERS :—The Bishop of St. David's	153
Rev. Canon Boyd	157
Dean of Ripon	162

	PAGE.
ADDRESSES:—Bishop of Carlisle	168
Bishop of Sodor and Man..	170
Rev. J. McCormick ..	172
DISCUSSION:—Rev. S. Andrew ..	175
Mr. F. S. Powell ..	177
Rev. Ishmael Fish ..	178
The Chairman ..	179

THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH IN RELATION TO INTEMPERANCE:—

Chairmen:—Bishop of Ripon and His Grace the President.

PAPERS:—The Mayor of Sheffield	179
Rev. Canon Basil Wilberforce	184

ADDRESSES:—Mr. Clarke Aspinall,	
J.P. ..	189
Dr. T. K. Chambers ..	191
Rev. J. Davenport Kelly ..	193

DISCUSSION:—Bishop of Niagara	196
Rev. Canon Ryle ..	196
Archdeacon Emery ..	198
Rev. Canon Harper ..	199
Rev. W. Barker ..	200
Rev. W. Moore Ede ..	202
Rev. W. Robinson ..	203

*CHURCH PROPERTY IN RELATION TO THE STATE:—

Chairman:—Bishop of Ripon.

PAPERS:—Rev. A. Gatty, D.D...	206
Mr. Hugh Birley, M.P. ..	212

ADDRESSES:—Mr. Arthur Thomas	218
Rev. Joseph Bardsley ..	227
Mr. George Harwood ..	231

DISCUSSION:—Rev. Canon Trevor	235
Dr. J. W. Eastwood ..	237
Rev. Canon Hulbert ..	239
Mr. Bernard Wake ..	240
Mr. H. Byron Reed ..	241
Rev. Dr. A. T. Lee ..	242
The Chairman ..	244

*ECCLESIASTICAL PATRONAGE:—

Chairman:—His Grace the President.

PAPERS:—Rev. John Oakley ..	244
Mr. C. H. Lovell ..	263

ADDRESSES:—Mr. W. Spencer	
Stanhope, M.P. ..	269
Rev. F. F. Goe ..	271
Mr. Beresford Hope, M.P.	274

DISCUSSION:—Rev. Harry Jones	276
Mr. T. Collins ..	277

	PAGE
DISCUSSION— <i>continued</i> .	
Rev. Canon Trevor..	278
Rev. C. B. Jackson ..	279
Archdeacon Cust ..	280
Mr. Ralph Fletcher ..	281
Mr. Wiltshire ..	282
Rev. G. Lewthwaite ..	282

*MARRIAGE LAW AS AFFECTING THE CHURCH:—

Chairman:—Archdeacon Blunt.

PAPERS:—Rev. Canon Temple ..	284
Mr. J. Theodore Dodd ..	290

ADDRESSES:—Dean of Manchester	296
Rev. G. Sandford ..	299
Bishop Ryan ..	300

DISCUSSION:—Mr. Beresford	
Hope, M.P. ..	301
Rev. Francis Pigou, D.D...	303
Rev. Mayow W. Mayow ..	304
Rev. T. Outram Marshall..	305
Wor. and Rev. Chancellor	
Espin ..	307
Rev. Reginald A. Cayley ..	309
Rev. John Oakley ..	309
Rev. John Eddowes ..	311
Archdeacon Ffoulkes ..	311
The Chairman ..	312

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 3rd.

THE CHURCH, LITERATURE, AND RECREATIONS:—

Chairman:—His Grace the President.

PAPERS:—Rev. C. Bullock ..	313
Rev. Harry Jones ..	320

ADDRESSES:—The Rev. the Earl	
of Mulgrave ..	324
Mr. William Smith ..	326
Rev. W. Boyd Carpenter ..	328

DISCUSSION:—Rev. G. Everard..	330
Rev. E. J. A. Fitz Roy ..	332
Rev. Brownlow Maitland ..	333
Rev. Mayow W. Mayow ..	334
Bishop of Manchester ..	335
Bishop Ryan ..	339

WOMAN'S WORK IN THE CHURCH:—

Chairman:—His Grace the President.

PAPERS:—Bishop of Ohio ..	340
Miss Whately ..	347
Rev. Francis Pigou, D.D...	353

ADDRESSES:—Rev. Berdmore	
Compton ..	358
Rev. G. W. Weldon ..	360

	PAGE.
DISCUSSION:—Rev. J. W. Gedge	363
Rev. C. N. Gray ..	364
Rev. Canon Hoare..	365
Dean of Chester ..	365

MEETING OF WORKING MEN.

Chairman :—His Grace the President.

ADDRESSES:—His Grace the President ..	367
Bishop of Carlisle ..	373
Mr. George Skey ..	378
Bishop of Manchester ..	380
Rev. Canon Ryle ..	386
The Mayor of Sheffield ..	389
His Grace the President ..	389

*PAROCHIAL CHURCH COUNCILS:—

Chairman :—The Mayor of Sheffield.

PAPERS:—Mr. Henry Stephenson ..	390
Rev. S. Earnshaw ..	396

ADDRESSES:—Hon. and Rev. W. H. Fremantle ..	402
Mr. J. T. Tomlinson ..	406
Rev. W. Hay Chapman ..	409

DISCUSSION:—Rev. W. Barker..	411
Rev. J. Llewelyn Davies ..	413
Mr. T. Collins ..	414
Rev. J. B. Pearson..	415
Mr. Abram Brooksbank ..	417
Rev. John W. Bardsley ..	418
Mr. Beresford Hope, M.P.	419
Rev. E. W. Makinson ..	421
Bishop of Dunedin..	422
The Chairman ..	423

*CATHEDRALS AND CATHEDRAL INSTITUTIONS:—

Chairman :—Bishop of Manchester.

PAPERS:—Dean of Chester ..	423
Rev. Canon Gregory ..	429

ADDRESSES:—Mr. Beresford Hope, M.P. ..	436
Bishop of Iowa ..	439
Mr. F. S. Powell ..	441

DISCUSSION:—Rev. Canon Trevor	443
Bishop of Carlisle ..	445
Dean of Ripon ..	447
Rev. Professor Rawlinson..	449
Archdeacon Iles ..	450
Rev. Canon Woodhouse ..	451

*SUNDAY SCHOOLS AND KINDRED AGENCIES:—

	PAGE.
<i>Chairman</i> :—Bishop Ryan ..	453

PAPERS:—Rev. T. A. Stowell ..	453
Archdeacon Blunt ..	464

ADDRESSES:—Rev. A. E. Humphreys ..	469
Rev. Cecil Hook ..	472
Rev. J. B. Draper ..	475

DISCUSSION:—Rev. J. W. Gedge	478
Rev. J. M. Townsend ..	480
Rev. J. Eddowes ..	481
Rev. J. T. Smith ..	482
Rev. Canon Gover ..	483
Rev. H. R. Sandford ..	484
Rev. J. A. Gabriel ..	485
Rev. G. S. Karney ..	486
Rev. J. D. Kelly ..	486

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 4th.

SPIRITUAL LIFE—ITS HELPS AND HINDRANCES:—

<i>Chairman</i> :—His Grace the President ..	488
--	-----

PAPERS:—Bishop of Rochester ..	488
Rev. Canon Blakeney ..	493
Rev. Canon Walsham How	497
Rev. E. H. Bickersteth ..	501

ADDRESSES:—His Grace the President ..	507
Rev. Canon Hoare..	507
Mr. George Skey ..	509

DISCUSSION:—Dean of Manchester ..	511
Rev. W. Boyd Carpenter ..	512
Rev. J. E. Johnson ..	513
Rev. Brownlow Maitland..	514
The Rt. Hon. Earl Nelson	515
Rev. J. Gott, D.D. ..	516

CANDIDATES FOR HOLY ORDERS:—

Chairmen :—His Grace the President and Bishop Ryan.

PAPERS:—Bishop of Niagara ..	517
Rev. J. Gott, D.D. ..	522

ADDRESSES:—Rev. W. Saumarez Smith ..	529
Rev. R. B. Girdlestone ..	532
Rev. Canon Norris..	535
Archdeacon Emery ..	537

	PAGE.
DISCUSSION:—Rev. Canon Walsham How	538
Rev. Dr. Thornton	539
Rev. Canon Ryle	541
Rev. Canon Bulstrode	542
Rev. Canon Clarke	544

*RESULTS OF RECENT DISCOVERIES
IN THE EAST:—

Chairman :—Bishop of Carlisle.

PAPERS:—Rev. Prof. Rawlinson	545
Rev. Canon Tristram	551
Mr. W. R. Cooper	558

DISCUSSION:—Bishop of Ohio	565
Rev. W. F. Birch	566
Rev. Brownlow Maitland	567
Rev. Dr. Payne	569
Mr. W. Rowbottom	569
The Chairman	570

CONVERSAZIONE AND FINAL
MEETING.

Chairman :—His Grace the President.

	PAGE.
The Mayor of Sheffield	571
His Grace the President	572
Bishop of Rupert's Land	574
Bishop of Carlisle	575
The Rt. Hon. Earl Nelson	577
Rev. Canon Ryle	578
The Mayor of Sheffield	579
Mr. Mark Firth	580
The Vicar of Sheffield (Rev. Canon Blakeney)	581
Rev. Canon Wilkinson	581
Rev. C. Sisum Wright	582
His Grace the President	583
Archdeacon Emery	583
The Rt. Hon. Earl Nelson	584

Church Congress, 1878.

EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING,

HELD AT SHEFFIELD,

ON TUESDAY, WEDNESDAY, THURSDAY, AND FRIDAY,

OCTOBER 1ST, 2ND, 3RD, AND 4TH.

PATRON AND PRESIDENT:

THE RIGHT HON. AND MOST REV. THE LORD ARCHBISHOP
OF YORK.

VICE-PRESIDENTS:

The Lord Archbishop of Armagh.
The Lord Archbishop of Dublin.
The Lord Bishop of Winchester.
The Lord Bishop of Llandaff.
The Lord Bishop of Ripon.
The Lord Bishop of Norwich.
The Lord Bishop of Bangor.
The Lord Bishop of Chester.
The Lord Bishop of St. Albans.
The Lord Bishop of Hereford.
The Lord Bishop of Peterborough.
The Lord Bishop of Lincoln.
The Lord Bishop of Salisbury.
The Lord Bishop of Carlisle.
The Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells.
The Lord Bishop of Oxford.
The Lord Bishop of Manchester.
The Lord Bishop of Chichester.
The Lord Bishop of St. Asaph.
The Lord Bishop of Ely.
The Lord Bishop of St. David's.
The Lord Bishop of Truro.
The Lord Bishop of Rochester.
The Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man.
The Lord Bishop of Lichfield.
The Lord Bishop of Guildford.
The Lord Bishop of Dover.
The Lord Bishop of Nottingham.
The Lord Bishop of Meath.
The Lord Bishop of Limerick.
The Lord Bishop of Tuam.
The Lord Bishop of Kilmore.
The Lord Bishop of Cork.
The Lord Bishop of Moray.

The Lord Bishop of St. Andrew's.
The Lord Bishop of Edinburgh.
The Lord Bishop of Aberdeen.
The Lord Bishop of Brechin.
The Lord Bishop of Argyll.
The Lord Bishop of Rupert's Land.
The Lord Bishop of Montreal.
The Lord Bishop of Capetown.
The Lord Bishop of Delaware.
The Lord Bishop of Guiana.
The Lord Bishop of Adelaide.
The Lord Bishop of Nova Scotia.
The Lord Bishop of Kingston.
The Lord Bishop of Ohio.
The Lord Bishop of Antigua.
The Lord Bishop of Ontario.
The Lord Bishop of Pennsylvania.
The Lord Bishop of Nebraska.
The Lord Bishop of Louisiana.
The Lord Bishop of Pittsburgh.
The Lord Bishop of Missouri.
The Lord Bishop of Falklands.
The Lord Bishop of Maritzburg.
The Lord Bishop of Long Island.
The Lord Bishop of Bloemfontein.
The Lord Bishop of Dunedin.
The Lord Bishop of Oregon.
The Lord Bishop of Huron.
The Lord Bishop of Barbados.
The Lord Bishop of North Carolina.
The Lord Bishop of Saskatchewan.
The Lord Bishop of North Texas.
The Lord Bishop of Haiti.
The Lord Bishop of Iowa.

VICE-PRESIDENTS—continued :

The Lord Bishop of New Jersey.
 The Lord Bishop of Niagara.
 The Lord Bishop of Shanghai.
 The Lord Bishop of Pretoria.
 The Lord Bishop of Nassau.
 The Right Rev. Bishop Perry.
 The Right Rev. Bishop Ryan.
 The Right Rev. Bishop McDougall.
 The Right Rev. Bishop Tufnell.
 The Right Rev. Bishop Staley.
 The Right Rev. Bishop Jenner.
 The Right Rev. Bishop Kelly.
 The Right Rev. Bishop Alford.
 The Right Rev. Bishop Mackenzie.
 The Very Rev. The Dean of York.
 The Very Rev. The Dean of Lichfield.
 The Very Rev. The Dean of Durham.
 The Very Rev. The Dean of Chester.
 The Very Rev. The Dean of Ripon.
 The Very Rev. The Dean of Manchester.
 The Venerable The Archdeacon of Ely.*
 The Venerable The Archdeacon of York.
 The Venerable The Archdeacon of the East Riding.
 The Venerable The Archdeacon of Cleveland.
 The Vicar of Sheffield (Rev. Canon Blakeney).
 His Grace the Duke of Rutland, K.G.
 The Right Hon. The Earl of Scarborough.
 The Right Hon. Earl Nelson.
 The Right Hon. Earl Manvers.

The Right Hon. the Earl of Wharnccliffe
 The Right Hon. Lord Viscount Halifax.
 The Right Hon. Lord Viscount Galway, M.P.
 The Hon. E. W. Lascelles.
 The Right Hon. Lord Houghton.
 The Hon. G. E. Lascelles.
 The Hon. C. L. Wood, M.A.
 Sir Harcourt Johnstone, Bart., M.P.
 Sir Charles Legard, Bart., M.P.
 The Rev. Sir Lovelace Stamer, Bart.
 The High Sheriff of Yorkshire (William Aldam, Esq.)
 Admiral The Hon. G. H. Douglas.
 Sir John Brown, J.P., D.L.
 The Right Hon. John Parker, M.A.
 A. J. G. Beresford Hope, Esq., M.P.
 A. J. Mundella, Esq., M.P.
 W. S. Stanhope, Esq., M.P.
 L. R. Starkey, Esq., M.P.
 Christopher Sykes, Esq., M.P.
 Rowland Winn, Esq., M.P.
 F. W. Bagshawe, Esq., J.P., D.L.
 The Mayor of Sheffield (F. T. Mappin, Esq.)
 The Master Cutler of Sheffield (W. H. Brittain, Esq.)
 The ex-Master Cutler (David Ward, Esq.)
 Colonel Neville.
 Thomas Brooke, Esq.
 F. S. Powell, Esq.

GENERAL COMMITTEE.

CHAIRMAN—HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP.

VICE-CHAIRMAN—THE VICAR OF SHEFFIELD (Rev. Canon Blakeney, M.A.)

CLERGY :—

Barnes-Lawrence, H. F.	Fa'loon, Canon.	Marsh, J. K.	Sandford, H.
Bennett, Prebendary.	Fallbon, W. H.	McCormick, J.	Scott, Canon.
Birley, Canon.	Faussett, A. R.	Merryweather, J. W.	Scott, Prebendary.
Blakeney, R.P., D.D.	Favell, H. A.	Milton, W.	Smith, T.
Blakeney, Canon.	Fenn, W. M.	Morse, Prebendary.	Stacey, J.
Brewin, G.	Gatty, A., D.D.	Mowat, J.	Stowell, T. A.
Bruce, Canon.	Glyn, Hon. E. C.	Newton, H.	Straton, Norman.
Calvert, Canon.	Goodhart, C. A.	Newton, W.	D. J.
Cardwell, J.	Gott, J., D.D.	Pearson, J. B., LL.D.	Temple, Canon.
Chorlton, S.	Harper, Canon.	Pelham, Hon. Canon	Turnbull, W. S.
Coombe, C. G.	Howard, Hon. Canon	Pigou, F., D.D.	Upcher, A. R.
Crosthwaite, R. J.	Hulme, T.	Philips, Canon.	Ware, W. W.
Douglas, Sholto.	Jackson, J.	Raine, Canon.	Wilkins, T.
Doyle, W.	Jeffcock, J. T.	Randolph, Canon.	Williams, F.
Draper, J. B.	Johnson, J. E.	Rigby, T.	Wilson, W. R.
Earnshaw, S.	Lane, W. M.	Russell, J.	Wright, C. Sisum.
Ede, W. Moore.	Maclure, E. C.	Sandford, G.	Wright, H. H.

GENERAL COMMITTEE.

LAITY :—

Bagshawe, F. W.	Esam, W. B.	Marples, W. K.	Smith, W.
Bainbridge, E.	Favell, W. F.	Moore, Alderman.	Stephenson, H.
Banham, Dr.	Fletcher, B.	Newbould, Jno.	Taylor, Alfred.
Binney, J.	Firth, T.	Powell, F. S.	Thomas, Arthur.
Birks, Edward.	Gainsford, T. R.	Roberts, S.	Trimnell, T. Tallis.
Brittain, W. H.	Hall, John.	Roberts, S., jun.	Turner, Thomas.
Brooksbank, A.	Hibbert, John.	Rodgers, H.	Vickers, C. E.
Broomhead, B. P.	Hudson, Edward.	Rodgers, T. W.	Wake, Bernard.
Burdekin, Benjamin.	Jackson, Arthur.	Shann, Dr.	Ward, David.
Cockayne, W., junr.	Jackson, Dr. J. E.	Sorby, H. C.	Watson, H. E.
Dodd, J. T.	Leng, W. C.	Sorby, W.	Wilson, C. Macro.
Duncombe, Arthur.	Mappin, F. T.		

SUBJECTS COMMITTEE

(Including all ex-officio Members),

CHAIRMAN—HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP.

VICE-CHAIRMAN—THE VICAR OF SHEFFIELD (REV. CANON BLAKENEY).

Brooksbank, Abm.	Gott, Rev. Dr.	Sandford, Rev. Geo.
Chorlton, Rev. S.	Jackson, Arthur.	Smith, Wm.
Coombe, Rev. C. G.	Johnson, Rev. J. E.	Stacye, Rev. J.
Doyle, Rev. W.	Mappin, F. T.	Stephenson, Hy.
Earnshaw, Rev. S.	McCormick, Rev. J.	Stowell, Rev. T. A.
Ede, Rev. W. Moore	Milton, Rev. W.	Straton, Rev. Norman.
Falloon, Rev. W. H.	Morse, Rev. Preb.	Temple, Rev. Canon.
Favell, Rev. H. A.	Mowat, Rev. J.	Thomas, Arthur.
Fenn, Rev. W. M.	Newbould, John.	Ward, David.
Fletcher, Mr. Benjamin.	Newton, Rev. W.	Ware, Rev. W. W.
Gainsford, T. R.	Pearson, Rev. J. B., LL.D.	Williams, Rev. F.
Gatty, Rev. A., D.D.	Pigou, Rev. F., D.D.	Wilson, C. Macro.
Glyn, Hon. and Rev. E. C.	Philips, Rev. G. H.	Wright, Rev. H. H.

C. SISUM WRIGHT,
SAML. ROBERTS, JUN., } *Hon. Secretaries.*

FINANCE AND RECEPTION COMMITTEE.

CHAIRMAN—HIS WORSHIP THE MAYOR OF SHEFFIELD (F. T. MAPPIN, Esq.)

VICE-CHAIRMEN—THE VICAR OF SHEFFIELD (REV. CANON BLAKENEY), and
THE MASTER CUTLER OF SHEFFIELD (Ald. DAVID WARD, Esq.)

Bagshawe, F. W.	Marples, W. K.	Sorby, W.
Bainbridge, E.	Moore, Alderman.	Turner, Thos.
Binney, J.	Rigby, Rev. Thos.	Upcher, Rev. A. R.
Broomhead, B. P.	Roberts, S. Jun.	Wake, Bernard.
Esam, W. B.	Russell, Rev. J.	Watson, H. E.
Favell, W. F.	Sandford, Rev. H.	Wilkins, Rev. Thomas.
Firth, Thos.	Smith, Rev. Thos.	Wright, Rev. C. Sisum.
	Sorby, H. C.	

W. MOORE EDE,
ARTHUR JACKSON, } *Hon. Secretaries.*

TREASURER :

MR. T. R. GAINSFORD.

HONORARY SECRETARIES :

REV. C. SISUM WRIGHT, M.A.
MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS, JUN., M.A.
REV. W. MOORE EDE, M.A.
MR. ARTHUR JACKSON.

SerVICES during Congress Week.

During Congress Week, Services were held in the following Churches:—

PARISH CHURCH (S. Peter's).

Tuesday, October 1st.—8 a.m., Holy Communion.

11 a.m., Morning Service.

Preacher—The Right Rev. THE LORD BISHOP OF RIPON.

5.15 p.m., Evening Service.

Preacher—The Venerable ARCHDEACON BLUNT.

Wednesday, Oct. 2nd.—8 a.m., Holy Communion.

5.15 p.m., Evening Service.

Preacher—The Right Rev. BISHOP RYAN.

Thursday, October 3rd.—8 a.m., Holy Communion.

5.15 p.m., Evening Service.

Preacher—The Right Rev. THE LORD BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.

Friday, October 4th.—8 a.m., Holy Communion.

5.15 p.m., Evening Service.

Preacher—The Right Rev. THE LORD BISHOP OF SODOR AND MAN.

CHRIST CHURCH, Pitsmoor.

Tuesday, October 1st.—8 a.m., Morning Service.

„ „ 5.15 p.m., Evening Service.

Wednesday, Oct. 2nd.—8 a.m., Holy Communion.

Thursday, October 3rd.—8 a.m., Morning Service.

„ „ 5.15 p.m., Evening Service.

Friday, October 4th.—8 a.m., Holy Communion.

Services during Congress Week—continued.

S. MICHAEL AND ALL ANGELS', Neepsend.

Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, October 1st, 2nd,
3rd, and 4th.

7.30 a.m., Holy Communion.

6 p.m., Evening Service.

S. SILAS'.

Wednesday and Friday, Oct. 2nd and 4th.—

8 a.m., Holy Communion.

S. MARK'S.

Tuesday and Thursday, October 1st and 3rd.—

8 a.m., Holy Communion.

Wednesday and Friday, October 2nd and 4th.—

8 a.m., Litany.

S. JUDE'S, Moorfields

Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, October 1st, 2nd,
3rd, and 4th.

7 a.m., 7.45 a.m., 8.30 a.m., Holy
Communion.

S. BARNABAS', Highfields.

Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, October 1st, 2nd,
3rd, and 4th.

7.45 a.m., Holy Communion.

*Special Services were also held during the week in most of the
other Sheffield Churches.*

THE SERMON

PREACHED IN THE PARISH CHURCH, SHEFFIELD,

ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 1ST, 1878,

BY THE

RT. REV. ROBERT BICKERSTETH, D.D.

LORD BISHOP OF RIPON.

THE SERMON

BY THE

LORD BISHOP OF RIPON.

"I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come."—*John* xvi. 12, 13.

SUCH are some of the parting words which our blessed Lord addressed to the apostles towards the close of his earthly ministry. They contain a touching reference to the inability of his followers to bear information which otherwise he would have imparted. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now."

The Redeemer was restrained by the infirmity of his disciples from unfolding truths which he desired to reveal. He had indeed already told them much. He had spoken of the atonement which he would effect upon the Cross, of his victory over death and the grave, of the marvels of the resurrection, and the stern realities of the judgment to come. But so far from having exhausted the topics upon which he desired to enlarge, he speaks as though let and hindered in the attempt. He had scarcely led his followers beyond the margin of the ocean of truth; there was a vast expanse over which he would have conveyed them had it not been for their incapacity. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now."

There is, however, even in this first clause of the text, the intimation of a period when the apostles would receive what now they were unable to bear. The expression, "Ye cannot bear them now," implies a period when the disability would be removed, and in the verse following it is distinctly promised, "When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." The pentecostal outpouring of God the Holy Ghost would enlarge their powers of comprehension, fetters which now held them in mental bondage would be

broken, and, impeded no longer by prejudice or unbelief, they would be guided by the preternatural agency of the Holy Ghost into all truth.

The passage contains an allusion to the third person of the God-head under a most significant title, "The Spirit of truth," and it contains also a description by Christ himself of the Spirit's office in respect of the Church.

I think it appropriate to so solemn an occasion as the present to direct attention to the remarkable title which is here assigned to the Holy Ghost, and also to our Lord's statement concerning his office. "He will guide you into all truth; he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come."

Now, it is important to bear in mind that each person in the ever blessed Trinity performs an equal part in the plan of redemption. That plan was so contrived as to exhibit the joint operation of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The work of the Redeemer is in some respects more prominent, but we may not attribute a higher degree of importance to the undertaking of Christ than to that of the Father and the Holy Ghost. That which was actually achieved by the second person of the Trinity was originated by the first, and can only be rendered effectual by the third. To God the Father the atonement was due. Had He not been satisfied with the obedience and the oblation of Christ, one element of confidence in the Mediator's undertaking would have been wanting, and apart from the agency of the Holy Ghost the redemption through Jesus would have been of little avail.

It is an elementary truth that man as to his fallen nature is in a twofold sense morally ruined. Not only is he exposed to death as the wages of sin, but he is utterly destitute of all inclination or power of himself to turn and repent.

The removal of the legal condemnation is due to the work of God the Son; that of spiritual death to the operation of God the Holy Ghost. Hence the office of each person in the sacred Trinity is equally essential. Deliverance from guilt and condemnation, restoration to God's favour here and to eternal happiness hereafter, these are blessings for which equal adoration is due to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost.

Moreover, as regards the work of each person in the Trinity, one grand aim was the manifestation of the truth. Even the infinite compassion of Jehovah could not save except in harmony with truth. In the whole economy of redemption there is the strictest regard to the maintenance of that truth which is one of the divine perfections. To this end was Christ born, and for this cause came He

into the world, to bear witness unto the truth. In like manner the work of the Holy Ghost is to exhibit or vindicate truth. Apart from other considerations, in confirmation of this I may observe that it is only in the strength which this divine agent supplies that the warfare with error can be successfully waged. There is no power by which the spirit of falsehood can be overcome but the power of the Holy Ghost.

Ever since the fall mankind have been more or less under the dominion of Satan. So extensive is his sway that he is called "the god of this world." He has endless resources at command. He blinds the eyes of them that believe not. As prince of the power of the air, he can wield the elements as weapons of assault. Legions of fallen spirits, cunning and malicious like himself, obey his direction. These have access to the mind; they can enter noiselessly and unperceived the recesses of the heart, instigating to evil, inflaming the corrupt passions of our fallen nature, stimulating each victim of their assault to that form of evil to which each is most prone.

Now, in the whole of this too successful endeavour to extend his dominion, Satan evermore acts through the instrumentality of falsehood. There is not a temptation he suggests which does not disguise a falsehood. The whole narrative of his victories is a narrative of successful delusion. By deceit he prevailed against our first parents in Eden, by falsehood he succeeded to destroy the old world. He persuaded men to discredit the prophetic warnings of Noah till the set time of opportunity came to an end, mercy reached its limit and judgment befell. He prevailed against ancient Israel again and again by false appearances, leading them to disbelieve the divine threatenings. The majority of mankind he plunged into idolatry, persuading them to worship false gods, the work of their own hands. During the personal ministry of our blessed Lord he pursued the same policy. He strove to invalidate the claims of Jesus, and when his empire was shaken and even devils confessed that the Prophet of Nazareth was the anointed of God, he made the false and daring suggestion, "This man casteth out devils by Beelzebub, the chief of the devils." In the visible church he has wrought incalculable mischief by the propagation of falsehood; not always, not generally by the instrumentality of falsehood in its undisguised form, but rather by masking the error under the semblance of truth, thus changing the truth of God into a lie, and so artfully interweaving what is true with what is false as effectually to neutralise the one and perpetuate the other. The instrumentality by which he still aims to assert his dominion is that of deception. He practises on mankind a moral cheatery, magnifying to the mental

vision the importance of things temporal, till things eternal seem to shrink into comparative insignificance. By a kind of moral witchcraft as of old, in Galatia, when the apostle wrote, "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth?"—he dupes men into the imagination that good is evil and evil good; that sin may be practised with impunity; that God's laws may be broken and yet the penalty of disobedience be never exacted.

Thus from first to last the machinery by which Satan works is that of deception, so that he may emphatically be styled the lying spirit that deceiveth the whole world.

Now whose is the victory by whom this deceiver may be overcome? Who shall detect the illusions by which we are so easily beguiled? Who shall enable man to perceive and follow the true end for which he was created? Who shall set things before him in their real proportions and convince him there is no solid happiness for an immortal creature but in the service of the ever-living Creator—no rest for the soul but as reposing in the love of God as a reconciled Father in Christ? To all such inquiries there is but one reply. None can effect this but God the Holy Ghost. If then it is only as enlightened by him and equipped with his might we can discern truth from error, grasp the one and renounce the other, what more appropriate designation could be given to this divine agent than this—"The Spirit of truth!" If destitute of his illumination or bereft of his energy men are left to drift at random through mazes of error, victims of delusion, beguiled by one whose ceaseless endeavour it is to oppose truth and establish falsehood; if the only power whereby we can resist the evil and choose the good is the power of the Holy Ghost; if to Him it belongs to enlighten the dark mind; disclose truth to those whom error has blinded;—could a more significant title be given to the Comforter than this which is ascribed to Him in the text—"Howbeit when he the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth?"

I pass on to notice, secondly, what is next affirmed respecting the Spirit's office.

Three distinct things are predicted. I.—He will guide you into all truth. II.—He shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak. And III.—He will shew you things to come.

First there is the promise, "He will guide you into all truth." Now due allowance is perhaps not always made for the deep-rooted prejudice which prevented the Jews from accepting Jesus as the Messiah. It is easy to enlarge upon their guilt in rejecting Him, nor may we extenuate the crime which they committed when Christ came to His own and His own received Him not.

There was ample evidence both from type and prediction to establish the claim of Jesus, and leave without excuse the Jews who disbelieved. At the same time we ought not to overlook the difficulties which must have presented themselves to the mind of the Jews. Expectations prevailed among them, founded upon their own scriptures, which were completely baffled by the manner of our Lord's advent. The whole nation was expecting a reigning Messiah, and although there were prophecies which alluded to suffering and humiliation, yet these were lost sight of amid the grander announcements of a Messiah who was to sit on the throne of his Father David and rule the nations with a rod of iron. Some of the most striking prophecies on which we are wont to rely for evidence related to his death and resurrection. The evidence furnished by these was not complete till after the event. St. Peter, speaking to his countrymen, declared, "I wot, brethren, that through ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers."

The twelve Apostles, chosen companions of Christ, in daily intercourse with Him during his personal ministry, were not fully convinced that He was the true Messiah till after the resurrection. Some of the questions they asked of Christ shew a surprising amount of ignorance and uncertainty. Even the boldness of Peter's avowal, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," which obtained for him a special blessing, indicated as much the weakness of his fellow disciples' faith as the strength of his own. Yet Peter, who made the confession, afterwards denied his Master. It is evident that the apostles up to the time of the ascension imperfectly understood the scope of the Redeemer's undertaking. Of a spiritual kingdom to be established in the hearts of men they could hardly form a conception. They recoiled with incredulous alarm from the thought of their Master's humiliation and suffering, although by no other means could redemption be procured. They could not comprehend beforehand the resurrection, for we read "they questioned one with another what the rising from the dead could mean." When Christ was put to death they gave up all for lost. The hope which they had faintly cherished that Jesus was He who should redeem Israel, for the time utterly vanished.

Thus even the Apostles themselves up to the period when Jesus rose from the grave had no certain confidence that he was indeed the Christ. Hence the promise, "He will guide you into all truth," refers primarily to the work of the Spirit in convincing the apostles of the actual Messiahship of Jesus. "He will guide you into all truth," he will unravel every mystery and disperse every doubt. He will unfold the hidden meaning of every symbol and pour light on every prediction, till under his illuminating

power the truth shall be fully apprehended. Then, beyond this, the promise related also to doctrines hitherto but dimly or partially revealed. Uniform though the plan of salvation has been from the first, many of its component parts were not fully disclosed till after the coming of the Holy Ghost. Where do you find the clearest exposition of the atonement, of the method of justification, of the office of the Spirit as an indwelling agent, of the glory which the risen believer will inherit in eternity, if not in epistles which the apostles wrote after they had received the pentecostal gift of the Holy Ghost? Thus was the promise fulfilled, "He will guide you into all truth." By the Holy Spirit's teaching they discerned in Jesus the true Messiah, they came to perceive with what accuracy all the lines of prophecy centre in him. The Spirit guided them into all truth concerning the person and the office of the Redeemer; he revealed the mysteries of the kingdom of God. If we may compare christianity to a temple, it was the Spirit of God who opened to the apostles its sacred portals, led them along its spacious courts, enabled them to scan its vast dimensions, revealed to them how arch and column are emblazoned with the perfections of divinity, and how the atmosphere which fills the edifice is the truth of Jehovah.

There are no limits to the province of this celestial agent as Guide into all truth. Wheresoever truth is to be discovered it is his office to lead the way. In large measure we have already reaped a fulfilment of the promise. The truth of christianity has been established. Eighteen centuries of conflict with opposing forces have served to prove that its foundation standeth sure. Doctrines unknown in their fulness to patriarchs and righteous men of old have been revealed. Under the fostering influence of christianity, science has advanced with giant step. The triumphs of civilisation have been in proportion to the spread of Christ's religion; and there is no nation or community where the gospel has been enshrined which does not afford some witness to the truth of the promise—"when he the Spirit of truth is come he will guide you into all truth."

The next thing affirmed of the Spirit is, "He shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak." The fact has been already alluded to that the plan of redemption involves the co-operation of each person in the Sacred Trinity. In the gradual development of the plan this has been remarkably exhibited. Mankind have been severally placed under three separate dispensations. There was the patriarchal, which prominently set forth the Unity of the Godhead; the legal dispensation, which served to exhibit the work of God the Son, and terminated with

his personal advent ; and then came the final dispensation, which is pre-eminently that of the Holy Ghost. But under each the way of salvation is the same. All centres in Christ. He is the Alpha and the Omega ; the author and finisher of our faith ; the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. To this truth the clause of the text, "he shall not speak of himself," mainly refers. He shall reveal no new scheme, propound no new gospel. This is in harmony with other statements ; for example, where our Lord declares concerning the Spirit, "He shall take of mine, and shew it unto you ;" or again, "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father shall send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." This agrees also with what we gather from other parts of revealed truth as to the Spirit's office. That office is to apply the benefits which flow from the work of Christ, to explain and bring home to the heart and conscience, the truth which has been already revealed.

And then it is added, "He will shew you things to come." This is the last thing predicted in the text. We can readily trace the fulfilment in the case of the apostles. The records which they have bequeathed to the church show what an insight was afforded to them of things to come. You find one apostle reasoning before the tribunal of Felix concerning righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, till the Roman governor trembled on his throne and craved a respite from the thrilling discourse : you find the same apostle quoting the words of Isaiah, "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, to conceive the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him." But he adds immediately, "But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit : for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." The same apostle elsewhere speaks of a coming period "when in the dispensation of the fulness of times, all things shall be gathered together in one in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth." Mention is elsewhere made of the coming of the Lord from heaven to change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body.

The marvels of the final resurrection are disclosed. In no dark syllables, it is foretold there will be a resurrection of the dead both of the just and the unjust, but "the dead in Christ shall rise first." The fortunes of the church, her conflicts and trials, the growth of error and false doctrine, the development of antichrist, and the ultimate victory of truth over every opposing force, these and kindred truths the Spirit revealed. And was it not when filled with the Spirit that the evangelist St. John, then an exile in Patmos, was permitted to behold

in mystic vision the future glories of the Redeemed, to gaze on the white-robed multitude with their emblems of purity and of triumph, and to hear those strains of heavenly music in which the church triumphant will celebrate the praises of God?

And was it only that the Spirit would impart an intellectual acquaintance with the things to come: or does not our Lord's promise rather mean that he would make those things living realities, causing them to exert a supernatural influence over men's hearts and lives? Surely it is the property of living faith, such as the Spirit of God imparts, to make its possessor realise the unseen, and touch and handle as it were the things which are not present to the bodily senses.

The promise, "He will shew you things to come," amounts to this: he will create in your minds so vivid a perception of the realities of eternity as to make them exercise a constraining influence over the life and conversation. He will shew you things to come, enabling you to look within the veil, and receive an impression from things in the far distance as if in the near present. We witness in the lives of apostles and confessors a verification of this promise. What else could have made these men, who aforetime were so timid at the approach of danger and so dull of apprehension, become so devoid of fear and quick of discernment? What else could have borne them so triumphantly to reproach and toil, to suffering, shame, and death itself for Christ's sake? Nor need we confine ourselves to the case of apostles and martyrs in earlier times; have we not an exemplification of the same truth in every living member of Christ's church militant here on earth? Yes, in the life of every faithful disciple, of all who in every rank and condition have been led to discern the deformity of sin and the beauty of holiness, to take up the cross and follow Christ, to fight the good fight of faith, and by patient continuance in well doing to seek for glory, honour and immortality, we may find a fresh fulfilment of the promise, "He will shew you things to come."

How glorious, then, is the office of God the Holy Ghost in behalf of the church! He comes as the promised Comforter proceeding from the Father and the Son to abide for ever with the redeemed. He comes as the Spirit of Truth to detect what is false, to reveal what is true. It is by the truth men are to be sanctified, separated from sin to holiness, rendered meet for the inheritance of the saints in light. Our Lord prayed for his disciples, "sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth." Truth is, then, the instrument of sanctification. The Spirit is the agent who makes the instrument effectual. Long has the earth groaned beneath the tyranny of the evil one: his efforts are unceasing in the world at large,

in the sacred enclosure of the church. There is one power by which his sophistries may be detected, his wiles withstood, his malice defeated. It is not the power of human wisdom, it is not the might of human intellect, it is not the skill of human reason. "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts." The greatest peril to the church at large, or to individual members of the church, arises from persistent opposition to the influence of the Holy Spirit. Let history speak. He was withstood by the men of the antediluvian world; and mark the result: "God said, My Spirit shall not always strive with man." The resistance was prolonged, and the set period of opportunity passed away, and the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished. He was resisted by the Jews both before and after the coming of our Lord. The protomartyr Stephen testified against them: "Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye." The desolations of Judæa, the prolonged dispersion of the Jews, their exile and calamities in every corner of the globe for eighteen centuries past, proclaim the result.

Men and brethren, may he not be grieved, may he not be resisted and provoked by ourselves? He is the Spirit of truth: every wilful leaning to error, every departure from the plain teaching of his inspired word, must be grieving to him. He is the Spirit of holiness: every deviation from purity in life or doctrine must be offensive in his sight. He is the Spirit of unity and concord: every breach of mutual charity, all needless strife and division, whatsoever is foreign to brotherly kindness amongst professing disciples of Christ—is a provocation to the Spirit.

We have need to pray earnestly for a large outpouring of his gracious influence. Who can estimate the effect on the church and on the world were there to come in these last days such a baptism of the Holy Ghost? The parched desert would become a fruitful field—the wilderness would blossom as the rose. The church would rise with renewed energy to her lofty vocation, and go forth on the work of evangelisation 'fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners.' Such an outpouring of the Holy Ghost would bind all hearts together as one man, and kindle in the church a zeal like that which inflamed the apostles of old. This would cause to cease unseemly contention about matters in themselves indifferent; this would make us follow the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another. The strength of the church, the strength of each member of Christ's mystical body, lies in the felt presence of the Lord God the Spirit. May He vouchsafe his special presence in the midst of our gatherings this week; may He grant

us the spirit of charity and mutual forbearance ; may He guide us into all truth ; may He impart the wisdom which is from above, which is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy. Then shall this Congress be for the glory of God and the edification of His Church : and those who have gathered here from many distant homes, to be cheered and refreshed by mutual converse, will depart with firmer resolution than ever, by the grace of God to continue in the faith and to persevere in well-doing, with this promise to sustain and to animate—‘ The spirit of truth will guide you into all truth ; he will shew you things to come.’

EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
CHURCH CONGRESS,
HELD AT SHEFFIELD, 1878.

EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
CHURCH CONGRESS,
HELD AT SHEFFIELD.

ALBERT HALL, TUESDAY AFTERNOON,
OCTOBER 1st, 1878.

The Right Hon. and Most Reverend the LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK took his seat as PRESIDENT at 2 P.M., and delivered the following

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

His GRACE, who was very warmly received, spoke as follows:—

Right reverend brethren, reverend brethren, and brethren of the laity,—In opening for the second time a meeting of the Church Congress, I might have supposed that upon the general subject of Church Congresses nothing need now be said. When we met in York in 1866 the Church Congress was but feeling its way; that particular year was marked by the invention of the working men's meeting, a feature with which no later Congress has thought it right to dispense. But twelve years of experience, which have brought some of us much nearer to the shore of life and to the solemn voyage, have seen the Church Congress ripen into maturity; and it is a disappointment to have to discuss the elementary question whether anyone ought to attend the Church Congress at all.

We have been lately told that it is inexpedient to do so; that error and not truth would be the result of this and every like meeting; and that therefore every friend of truth would do well to keep away. By such an argument it has been sought to induce all the clergy of the evangelical school to withhold their presence and their influence from this meeting. It would almost seem enough to answer that, as the Congress is a public meeting, and its character is determined by those who attend it, the inevitable result of a policy of abstinence

would be that the opinions of those who held back would find no place and exercise no influence in the general impression made by the proceedings. As you well know, this Congress only works by way of general impression, and it neither enacts laws nor passes resolutions which might be irksome to a minority, and might be a very good reason for the silent protest of absence. That being so, and it being assumed that every opinion will receive here a fair and patient hearing, it is difficult to understand what is gained to the cause of truth by letting slip one great occasion in every year for uttering the truth as we regard it. The Church of Christ was not built up by such dainty methods. In season and out of season, those who preached Christ were ready with a word for Him even when the reward was no better than "away with him," or "thou art beside thyself," or at best, "we will hear thee again on this matter." If the Church had refused to speak in the presence of a hostile majority, she would have held her peace in Corinth and in Rome, and her feet would never have sought the shores of this island. The Church Congress is now a fact; it suits the taste and temper of members of the Church, both clerk and layman, to come once a year, and to compare notes, and to listen to words of counsel, even though the range of subjects is limited, and the harp that makes music for us has but a few strings. Those who stay away could not possibly hope to make such meetings cease: they will still be held, in spite of such protest, simply because Church people like them, and can do what they like, and all that will be achieved will be that the harp will have fewer strings, and that the favourite tone of those who have removed some of them will be absent from the general harmony. Who would gain by this? I will not detain you with the obvious answer.

There is another indictment against Church Congresses, in which it must be admitted that there is a grain of truth. It is said that they tend to smooth over and to conceal differences; to raise a cry of "Peace" when there is none; and that in this way there is a danger that truth and error may meet together with the kiss of peace. When men assemble together, no doubt, whatever the subject that engrosses them, they tend to find out what is best and kindest in each other; and I suppose that after a meeting of the British Association some wise man finds that another who differs from him as to the duration of the last glacial period is not without features of humanity—or that after a discussion of the Archæological Institute, the learned person who has been wounded in his finest feelings by a rough antagonist, who will have it that the round towers of Ireland were but safe pens for pigs and sheep in war time, sees reason before they part to admit that even this crudity may be passed over, if not quite forgiven, in one who has some sound notions of archæ-

ology still. The subject which engrosses our attention is the highest of all. And there is one bond of union amongst us which ought always to count for much: we all invoke the name of one Saviour; all are baptised into one body; all will meet in one common judgment. Our differences are great and patent: there is no chance of their being forgotten here, where every day's discussion will drag them into light. But are we on that account to shut ourselves up in those differences, as though the common ground went for nothing? Are we to act towards those who hold the same profession as though they were outcast and infidel? That question is answered as soon as it is proposed. We do come here to seek common ground. If in the glow of friendly intercourse, in the pleasant surprise of finding good where we looked for mere hindrance and repulsion, we indulge in an optimist view of our position, and are disposed to make light of the troubles that do, no doubt, surround us: there is no enduring harm from that, for the facts, strong and stern, will make themselves felt; but an enduring advantage may be ours in the better understanding of each other—the larger charity, the correction of narrow views, and the mutual suggestion of new modes of spiritual activity and life. The Church, whilst it consists of men of many schools and parties, has a mind of its own and a life of its own different from the mind of any one party in it, just as in political matters the nation has a will and a path distinct from those of either of the great parties in the State. Great gatherings of this kind enable us to ascertain the mind of the Church. We vote no resolutions; we have no need to strain to persuade a majority or to snatch a division; yet out of our discussions will emerge, to those that follow them, clear signs of the turn that thought is taking. We cannot ascertain the force of the wind that bloweth where it listeth, nor measure the speed of the currents; but we can observe the position and course of the ship, and from that we can infer the nature of the forces that urge it along. Such a set of observations we are now about to make: they will not be in themselves decisive, but they will give us real help.

I have ventured on these observations not at all to censure those who would discourage attendance on the Church Congress, but rather on behalf of those of the Evangelical school who have come here in spite of such discouragement, and have given their time and earnest endeavours to the preparations for this Congress, and who have resolved from the first, and this I say with full knowledge of the facts, that the various schools of thought should be fully represented here, and that a fair hearing should be given to all.

Whether it may not be desirable in future Congresses that a longer time should be allotted to important subjects than the present

arrangements allow, is a question that might well be considered. After the invited readers and speakers are heard, but a little time remains to be divided among a multitude, in slender portions, for the discussion of all that has been suggested in addresses carefully prepared; and a great many must depart unsatisfied with their share, or without a share. For a remedy, either the number of subjects must be reduced or the number of sections increased. Judging by the analogy of other societies, I am surprised that this latter expedient has not been forced on us before. The advantages of an undivided assembly are great; but we already meet in two sections, and the principle of division once admitted, and its disadvantage accepted, the number of sections should perhaps be as great as the convenience of the Congress requires.

It is my duty to offer to the Lord Bishop of Ripon our thanks for the valuable sermon which he has just delivered, and our earnest wish that it may please God long to continue to him that health and energy which are required for his arduous duties, and which at the time of the last Congress seemed not yet to be re-established after a severe illness.

We are able to welcome here on the present occasion several Bishops from the American Church. The time has gone by when it might have been necessary to assure them that their presence is welcome, and that everything which relates to their Church is regarded by us with deep interest. The commercial relations between this town and the United States are of old standing, and no American would find himself regarded here as a complete stranger. But the ties between the two Churches have been drawn very close indeed during late years, mainly, on our side, through the influence of the late lamented Bishop of Lichfield; and among the most auspicious circumstances of the present meeting we shall all regard the presence of so many American representatives as the foremost.

That which brought them to this country was, as we are all aware, the Lambeth Conference, held during the month of July. Exactly one hundred Bishops assembled at Lambeth; and having taken part in the deliberations from first to last, I venture to affirm that the tone and temper with which they were conducted throughout, the earnest desire shown on all sides to arrive at judgments alike true and right and charitable, the mutual courtesy and forbearance, joined to the great independence of utterance, were such as to give good hope that the Holy Spirit of God, solemnly invoked day by day, was truly present with us for our guidance.

What, it will be asked, were the results of so large a concourse from quarters so distant? They will be variously estimated,

according to the expectations or inclinations of those who study them. There was no power in the Conference to pass laws or canons, and it was careful to keep within its powers. Opinions, however, were given by the various committees on a large range of subjects, and after careful consideration by the whole body, they have gone out to the church at large. I shall be much disappointed if they do not bear fruit in the increase of missionary activity; in the avoidance of confusion between different missionaries in the same country; in a greater circumspection as to the admission of new clergy to labour abroad; in the clearing up of a misunderstanding that threatened at one time to involve in a permanent dispute one of our great missionary societies and some of the Bishops of India and the East; in a fuller knowledge of, and consequently in a greater sympathy with, the work of the Lord going on through the means of distant churches; and even in a gradual abatement of that which seems to many of us a needless addition to our troubles, the arbitrary changes in ritual, made without authority, and persisted in against lawful remonstrance. These are but some of the subjects that were dealt with by the committees, and later by the whole Conference.

One of the subjects to which my attention was most directed was the dispute between the great and venerable Church Missionary Society and one of the Eastern bishops. I will mention it because it bears on some of the remarks that I have made already. I am free to confess that I undertook to preside over that committee with an amount of misgiving such as has not attended other public duties. To moderate between inflexible wills, stiffened by controversy into adamant, is a thankless task and usually a hopeless one; and this was the lot that seemed to be assigned to me. The actual lot was far different. If there ever was any obstinacy of will, both parties seemed to have left it in the outer hall at Lambeth, with the umbrellas and other tackle that belong to storms, and they brought to our difficult task a manifest desire to help forward the solution of a painful question, if any could be proposed. Abler advocates of the two views could not have been found, but they were also most candid advocates. Whether the result is one which will satisfy all parties I do not venture to say: nothing has yet reached me to prevent the hope of that most happy result; but I think I am violating no confidence in saying how happy it made me to find that the elements of strife were wanting—that the wish for peace was the first wish of all. May I go a step further? No one more cordially joined in the effort to promote a good understanding than the bishop in whose diocese the fire was first kindled, who accepted readily limitations on his episcopal

authority greater than are imposed at home. Here is a good illustration of the advantage of free conference. If I am right in my hopes, a practical solution has been found of a dispute of which some of the most experienced friends of the Church Missionary Society have spoken with much sorrow and heaviness of heart. Nor has there been any surrender of principle on either hand. But the proceedings of the Lambeth Conference, taken as a whole, seem to shew clearly the nature of the task that lies before the Anglican Church, the means and methods which it has to follow, and the errors which it hopes to avoid.

The names of the sees from which a hundred representatives have come give a rough measure of the task. From India, with its many tongues and creeds; from Australia, identified with the mother country by almost every interest; from the United States; from the scattered populations of our North American colonies; from China, where a kind of rivalry of churches has already sprung up, the representatives have come. They are spread over the globe—the churches to which they belong and the work they are actually doing is not new, is not slight. The mode in which they are working is settled already. In the words of the Conference itself, “We proclaim the sufficiency and supremacy of Holy Scripture as the ultimate rule of faith, and commend to our people the diligent study of the same. We confess our faith in the words of the ancient Catholic creeds. We retain the apostolic order of bishops, priests, and deacons. We assert the just liberties of particular or national churches. We provide our own people in our own tongue with a Book of Common Prayer and offices for the administration of the Sacraments, in accordance with the best and most ancient types of Christian faith and worship.” There is in these words no approach to Rome—they are the echo of the words of the Reformers themselves. With the Bible for its rule and the Prayer Book for its ritual, and with the three orders of the ministry, the Church is doing her work at present, and means so to continue.

Of the novel practices unknown to the Church of England half-a-century ago, the Conference has spoken in the most distinct, though temperate, terms of condemnation. It is very explicit on the subject of the confessional, which, as we know, can lay no claim to primitive antiquity, and which is deeply repugnant to the feelings and instincts of our people as a whole.

Without proceeding to quote the words, or wishing to engage in controversy in these few opening remarks, I will venture in all love and good-will to ask a candid consideration of a very few sentences in conclusion.

The Church is surrounded by perils, not those of persecution, but

the far more grievous ones of sin and disbelief. The true questions of the hour are not those which belong to the inside of theology, so to speak, but to the threshold, as whether there be any soul, any future life, any sin, any need of redemption, any Redeemer, any God. Inquiries on all these subjects are pursued with a pitiless logic, an erudition, an acuteness greater than any former time has exhibited. The truth of Christ shall never die out, but because of these assaults the faith of many shall turn to desperate doubt and the love of many shall wax cold.

There are other evils, too, with which we have to cope—the luxury of great cities; the idle affluence; the deep ignorance; the want of Christian ministrations for the scattered part of our flocks, producing in so many cases the habit of living without God in the world. All these are before us and around us, and we want all our strength, all our forces united, to deal with them in the spirit of Christ.

I would venture to say to those who have formed the project of bringing the Church of England much nearer the Romish Church, Is it not time to decide that no such transformation could take place, and that the effort to make it is so much labour lost? The Church, so far as the bishops expound her meaning, does not intend to change; she aims at keeping the old path. Granting that you were conscientious in desiring to graft upon her a mediæval confessional and a modern doctrine of the Eucharist, the effort has now been made, and it has not in any true sense succeeded. Meantime the enemy without takes much advantage of the time of struggle, and it should be abridged if we are to turn to confront in one line the real foes. Romish, or anything like Romish, the Church of England will not be.

But there are lines of defence which we might all join to defend, for the programme of the Conference which I have just read might carry all with it. Let us at this last hour of our trial lay aside our unhappy divisions, and hold fast that upon which we could unite. Such a return of union would, by the divine blessing, be the beginning of a great development of religious life throughout the Christian world. India is coming over to you in tens of thousands; our teeming colonies accept your instruction; in the heathen races old false creeds are worn out, and the soul, which ever abhors a vacuum, is casting about for something better to believe. The Anglican Church has her opportunity. To unite is to embrace it; to remain immersed in the old squabbles which can issue in no success is to let the occasion slip away for ever.

And now, brethren in the Lord, let us address ourselves to the discussion of the questions proposed to us. Speaking the truth fearlessly, but speaking it in love, let us pray that the fruit of our

debates may be greater peace and more love for Christ and more zeal in his service. May everyone of us, when the Congress closes, look back upon it as a time of profit, and be able to recall many moments during its deliberations in which our hearts burned within us with holy zeal and godly love. And may we so act that those who are without may be won by our behaviour, and may see that God has in truth been with us.

The Archbishop then called upon the meeting to join with him in reciting the Apostles' Creed.

FOREIGN AND COLONIAL MISSIONS: THEIR CONDITION, ORGANISATION, AND PROSPECTS.

PAPERS.

The Right Rev. WM. BACON STEVENS, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Pennsylvania.

I do not think it necessary to occupy your time with any effort to show the necessity of foreign missions, or to defend them from their manifold assailants: they stand recognised on your programme as a Christian fact, and as such we have to deal with them. Every day the Church is learning more and more the lessons that her growth, her health, her very life depends on her mission work in foreign lands, and every day the blessed fruits of its foreign work are made more and more manifest, so that the most eminent statesmen and scientists and historians are forced to say that the cause of sound government, true science and real philanthropy are deeply indebted to the work and teachings of the missionaries of the Church of Christ.

It is, however, in spiritual results that the greatest blessings of the work are to be found. These results are large and gratifying, and I might almost say are beyond the power of the present faith of the Church to believe or apprehend.

I have not the means of tabulating these results, so as to present them in a form that would at a glance, as it were, show what had been done; but this much I can say, from long and careful investigation, that the mission work of the Church in "the regions beyond" has a thousandfold repaid every outlay of time, money, or men; and that, if we estimate results by the arithmetic of the gospel, which puts the worth of one soul as of more value than the whole world, and the conversion of one soul as the cause of as much joy to the angels of God as the creation of a world, then must we say that no estimate that the mind can make, or figures represent, can fully set forth the vastness and value of the work which the Church has done, and is now doing, in its foreign mission field.

Much, however, as has been done in the past, there is still "much land to be possessed;" and the voice of our Divine Leader to the Church is—Up, and go in and possess the land! for the Lord hath

given it to his Son for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession. These words of cheer and hope sound along the whole line of the sacramental host of God's elect, and should nerve each arm with new strength, and stir up each heart to new zeal, in so blessed a warfare. Never has the Church been in so good a condition to carry on this work as now, and never has it been in so good a position to meet its responsibilities.

The resisting power with which the Church has to contend is less now than ever before; and the aggressive power to press on her work is greater now than ever before. I say that the resistance to be encountered is less now than at any previous time. Why? Not because sin has lost any of its antagonism to God: not because the enmity of the human heart to the truth is less: not because the great adversary of God and man is not as vigilant and powerful as ever; but because there are at work in all the principal religions of paganism disintegrating elements, eating out their life-blood, diminishing their vigour, and making them less bold, defiant, and persecuting than before.

Such religions as Brahminism and Buddhism and Confucianism cannot long resist the encroachments of modern science and modern philosophy. They must go down before the advance of science, which necessarily uproots a religious system based on false principles of cosmogony, and the advance of a mental philosophy which must perforce break up the systems of false psychology in which these old religions have reposed for ages.

Science and philosophy are themselves going forth as children of light into these once dark regions of error, and are pointing out the flaws and fictions which lie at the basis of all these towering systems of idolatry. As a broader education advances, as a better intelligence is diffused, as schools and colleges and learned societies shall be fostered, as the results of modern discoveries in all departments of knowledge shall be more widely accepted, so will the gross darkness lose its grossness, and become at least crepuscular, and by and by this twilight will, by the very laws of light, work its way into increasing brightness, and herald the dawn of the rising of that Sun of righteousness which, wherever it shines, shines with healing in its wings.

The work which is thus being done by the science and literature of the day is to the work of Christian missions what the engineers and sappers and miners do for the army. They map out the land, they remove obstacles and open up pathways, and thus prepare the way for conquest. Through the researches of philologists and geographers and natural philosophers and others, we have learned more of the inside of these heathen religions, their dogmas, their inner life, their real foundations, within the last half century than ever before. We now go forth to meet them, knowing exactly what we cope with, and how best to do it; and hence fight with a decided advantage, and with hopes of assured success. All through Asia, and in all its leading religions, we see to-day the stirring up of the public mind, and the restless longings of the Oriental spirit. It crops out in a hundred ways; and the daily development of God's Provi-

dence in shaking old faiths, in weakening old systems of error, in loosing old fetters of superstition, and in introducing new lines of thought and action and new views of truth and right, is indeed marvellous, and cannot be observed by the Christian without deep thanksgiving and delight.

What is true in this respect concerning Buddhism and Brahminism, and the other religions of Asia, is also true of Mohammedanism. It is evidently in its last days. God has wisely over-ruled its existence for the production of most important future benefits to his Church. But now, "Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin," are broadly written on the walls of the Sultan's palace; and when the European Powers, which now, for a purely political reason, uphold the Sultan, the supreme Calif or high priest of the Moslem faith, shall withdraw their supporting hands, the throne of Turkey will fall, and with it the *prestige* and the power of the Mohammedan religion. In addition to this, many of the most fundamental tenets of the Koran are totally at variance with the generally accepted teachings of modern learning; and as true knowledge gains ground, these errors will appear more clearly, and the system which is based upon them must prove itself, to the demonstration of all thinking minds, to be also erroneous and unworthy of belief. We are, then, in a better position to-day to carry on the work of missions than in any previous period of the world's history since the days of the apostles.

When the religion of Jesus Christ began its career, and for hundreds of years after, the civilisation of the world was entirely pagan, and not merely pagan, but directly adverse to everything that was essentially Christian in social and domestic life. The governing power of the world was also pagan; oftentimes a paganism roused into intense persecution of the new religion, and seeking nothing less than its complete extirpation. Then the received science and literature of the world was essentially pagan and superstitious; so much so, that scarcely any of the physical sciences, as then taught, have any place in modern learning. Then the means of intercommunication between nation and nation were slow, painful, and dangerous, so that travellers were few, and each nation was shut up to the laws and usages and doings of its own people, with scarce any knowledge of the existence even of outside and distant kingdoms. Then the ability to transmit thoughts by books was toilsome and costly, and only a few could possess themselves of the simplest parchment volumes. Then the education of the masses had not been thought of, and the vast majority of the people could neither read nor write, and were steeped and stultified in ignorance. Then commerce was mostly confined to the Mediterranean Sea, and the western coast of Europe, and the southern borders of Asia, linking together only a few sea-ports of a very few nations by a scanty trade. All this, and much more that hindered the work of the Lord, has passed away; and how different is the present aspect of the world! Now the civilisation of the world rests at least on a Christian basis, and finds its highest exponent in the most Christian nation. Now the most intelligent and influential of the governing powers of the world are nominally Christian, and only recently the Queen of

Christian England has been proclaimed Empress of idolatrous India. Now there is a vast and varied Christian literature and science brought to bear on people and races heretofore shut out from common education. Now commerce knits together remotest lands, bridges over ocean-separated countries, and by steam and electricity masses the whole commercial world into certain great metropolitan centres of trade, which in their turn radiate their mercantile and manufacturing influences all over the earth. Now regions long shut out from European eyes—long marked on maps as "*terra incognita*"—as in Africa for example—are being explored, and will soon be opened to the merchant and the missionary. Now the leading languages of the world have been analysed and digested into grammars and lexicons, and so made ready to have the gospel poured into these vessels of thought, and drawn out as the new wine of the kingdom to refresh the varied races of the earth. Now science, with its many agencies and many hands, is breaking down the effete systems of superstition by showing their variance with the first principles of natural philosophy and of geographical facts, on which the religion of six hundred millions of souls rests. Thus, wherever we look, we find the resisting power of paganism weakening, and the aggressive power of the Church strengthening.

If now we turn from this mere worldly and intellectual aspect of the case to what the Church is doing, we see here a great advance on the old order of things. Foreign missions, once looked upon with opposition and distrust, once frowned upon by Government at home and abroad, once disesteemed by bishops and the great mass of the clergy, once sneered at by the politicians and the press, and looked upon by nearly all as but the outburst of over-heated zeal seeking to do impossible and unneeded things, are regarded in this light no longer. Foreign missions have conquered for themselves a bright name and a high place in the Church of this age. The lives of the missionaries have been "living epistles, known and read of all men." The works of the missionaries have everywhere been productive of wholesome and elevating results. The schools they have set up, the colleges they have established, the churches they have founded, the presses they have set in motion, the industry they have fostered, the purity they have inculcated, the education they have disseminated, the hospitals they have builded, the varied institutions of philanthropy they have originated, the social and domestic and national evils they have remedied, and the social, domestic, and national blessings they have imparted, have won for the work of missions a world-wide and church-wide fame, and settled for ever the question as to the duty and the privilege of the Church to carry on this blessed work.

Four things are, however, specially needed to keep up and carry on this work to its full completion.

One of these four things is *Men*—men called of the Holy Ghost, and separated to this work as Barnabas and Saul were in the Church in Antioch. We need men specially fitted for the field—men of true piety, sound judgment, and of intense love for souls—men ready to endure hardness as good soldiers of Jesus Christ, patient in difficulties,

firm in trials, having zeal, but tempered by knowledge, of cultivated minds, of sympathetic spirit—men who will draw rather than drive, who will be as good shepherds to the flock, rather than as lords over God's heritage, and who are ready to count all things but loss for the privilege of spreading abroad the knowledge of Christ, and who, free from party spirit and party strife, will, on the broad basis of our reformed Church, earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints, and, if need be, die in its defence.

The foreign work, then, calls for men as learned, as bright, as godly, as wise, as energetic as any work in England. Nor should I much, if any, exceed the truth, if I should say that it requires cleverer men to be successful as missionaries than to be parish priests at home.

The second thing we need is *Money*. Our blessed Lord, though He could turn stones into bread, and though He did multiply a few loaves so as to feed thousands, and could, consequently, have easily supplied by a miracle the daily food of himself and his apostles, yet did not do it, but depended for his own and their daily support on the ministrations of holy women, and on those sums which were put into "the bag," which was kept by Judas, as the treasurer of the apostolic band. To sustain foreign missions, money, and that too in large quantities, is required. For this money the individual members of the Church are responsible before God. They have freely received the gospel—it is their duty freely to give. Nor are any exempt from this obligation; and the sum given should be in proportion to the means possessed, and should represent in some measure our sense of what we owe to God for his unspeakable gift to our own souls. Here comes in a very important duty of the clergy;—it is to teach the people committed to their charge the duty and the grace of giving to the Lord.

Very significant is that little remark of the evangelist, that our Lord "sat over against the treasury, and beheld how the people cast money into the treasury." How it brings out the interest which Christ feels in the support of the services of his Church! How it marks his knowledge of each man's gift! How it typifies the fact that even now, though ascended far up above all things, He yet has his eye on the treasury of his Church, and notes each giver, and each gift that is cast into it. Might not such a passage be used by the clergy as a text for teaching their people the privilege and the duty of Christian benevolence? Might they not tell that now, as of old, the work of the Lord is supported mostly by voluntary offerings? Might they not say that, as in the temple of Herod, so in the Christian temple, the Lord sits over against the treasury? And might they not enforce, from his gracious commendation of the poor widow who cast in two mites, "being all her living," how He recognised the humblest gifts, how He estimated gifts not by their intrinsic value, but by the spirit of the giver, and how He accepted even the giving to him by this widow of all her living as a sacrifice not too costly for her to offer or for Him to receive. It is only when "all the tithes" are brought "into the store-house," that God has promised to "open the windows of heaven" and "pour out a blessing that there shall not be room enough to receive it."

A third thing needed is *Prayer*.

We have in our prayer-book prayers for the extension of Christ's kingdom, for the sending forth of labourers into the field white unto harvest, for the gathering in of God's elect, for the unifying of the Church under its one Divine Head and Saviour; but what we peculiarly need in reference to this mission work is more social prayer and more personal prayer in its behalf. The subject of foreign missions must be taken to our firesides and to our closets, so that it shall inweave itself into the very texture of our daily life. We cannot pray long and earnestly for missions without kindling our hearts into a glow of love and zeal for missions. "While we muse" of this subject at the throne of grace the fire will burn, and then we shall not only speak with our tongues, but work with our hands and give of our means.

More of this private and intercessory prayer is needed for the greater advancement of this work.

The bishops of the Church have everywhere, and especially the last few years, recognised the need and the power of intercessory prayer for our missions; they have set apart a day for special intercessions in their behalf. But this is only a small part of our duty: we must make this work of God a subject of daily prayer, that there may come down on all our mission-fields a daily blessing.

Oh! brethren, what a power will there be in prayer, when all the people of God join with one heart and one tongue in the petition, "Thy kingdom come," and shall translate that petition into liberal gifts and zealous acts to and for Christ and his Church.

The fourth and last thing which is needed is the *Outpouring of the Holy Ghost*.

This is, indeed, implied in the previous words; but I want to emphasize this thought, because in our constant talk about men and means and measures, we are too apt to overlook or think but little of the need of the Holy Ghost. What we want is to bring out into practical life the great thought that we can succeed in our work only as we work in and by the Holy Ghost.

He is the Lord and giver of life to those dead in trespasses and sins. He is the enlightening Spirit, who alone can drive away the darkness of error and give the light of truth. He, the Inspirer of the Bible, is the only one who can make that Bible "quick and powerful and sharper than any two-edged sword." He, who formed Christ in the womb of his virgin mother, is the only one who can take of the things of Christ and effectively show them unto men. He, by whose descent on the day of Pentecost the apostles were "endued with power from on high," is the only one who can now endue the ministers of Christ with unction and power. He, "by whose spirit the whole body of the Church is governed and sanctified," is the only one who makes the sacraments of Christ's institution effectual signs and seals of grace to those who rightly receive them. He, under whose divine dispensation we now dwell, can alone make that dispensation the wisdom of God and the power of God unto salvation. In whatever aspect we view this third person of the ever-blessed Trinity we find increasing evidence that the whole

work of missions is dependent on the coming down upon us of his gracious influence, in preparing the soil, in fructifying the seed, in sending forth the husbandman, in giving the early and latter rain, in imparting fertilising warmth and light, in perfecting the grain, and in enabling the reapers at last to shout their glad harvest-home, in concert with the angels, as they bind their sheaves and gather them into the garner of eternal life. All is his work, from seed to fruit. All is his work, from foundation-stone to top-stone. All is his work, from death unto sin to life eternal at God's right hand. What earnest cries ought we to utter in the ear of the prayer-hearing God, that He will send down to us the Holy Ghost to comfort us, to enlighten us, to guide us, to sanctify us in our present work, so that the comfortable gospel of Christ may be truly preached, and truly received, and truly followed in all places, to the breaking down the kingdom of sin, Satan, and death, and to the bringing in of the full and perfect kingdom of God's dear Son!

Brethren, if there is one glory more than any other which belongs to the great Church of England, it is that she is a missionary Church. Herself the child and nursling of foreign missions in ages past, she has now become the nursing-mother of churches in all quarters of the globe. She sent over her missionaries nearly two hundred years ago to the few plantations on the American seaboard, and now the vine thus planted has taken root and filled that land. She sent out her missionaries to the Canadas, and the now provincial Church of that dominion attests the vitality of the seed there sown. She sent out her missionaries to India, and though repelled by a mercenary monopoly, yet God broke down that politico-mercantile government, and now the Church has grown into vast proportions, and wields a commensurate power over all those possessions in India. She sent out her missionaries to Africa, from Abyssinia to the Cape of Good Hope, and now East, West, and South Africa have their thriving dioceses and active clergy. She sent out her missionaries to Australia, following her children as they migrated towards the Southern Cross, and there in that far-off land and in the isles of the Pacific, where cannibalism once reigned, are now found churches, dioceses, provinces still holding allegiance to the mother Church. She has sent out her missionaries to China and the Eastern Archipelago, and there, also, in the very midst of the so-called central flowery kingdom and among the savage Dyaks of Borneo, has she set up the standard of the cross under her episcopal standard-bearers. This is the glory of England and of England's Church. God has made her by his providence the instructress of the world in pure and undefiled religion. Her open Bible, her reformed faith, her apostolic ministry, her ancient creeds, her primitive liturgy, her Christ-ordained sacraments, her pure gospel of salvation, have moulded the character of all the churches of the English-speaking race wherever found, and have set up models of church polity and worship in all heathen lands. God has highly honoured her in making her his handmaid in such a work, and He graciously holds out to her the promise that, if faithful to her trust, she shall be more successful in the future than in the past, and the

conquests which, through her agency, shall yet be made for Christ, shall exceed her former victories and crown her with still higher glory as the great missionary Church, not of Protestant Europe only, but of the Christian world.

The Rev. GEORGE FREDERICK MACLEAR, D.D., Head Master of
King's College School, London.

THE point to which I propose to address myself in this Paper is "The Bearing of the History of the Western Missions of the Past on the Prospects of the Missions of the Present Age."

I have chosen this point for more than one reason. In the first place, while there are many who, to use the words of Bishop Butler, "require, in regard to Missions, more than either experience or Scripture give ground to hope for in the present course of the world,"* there are also a larger number who never tire of magnifying difficulties, of reckoning up discouragements, and discrediting success. Now the history of past efforts has a lesson for both these classes of persons. While, on the one hand, it corrects extravagant expectations, on the other it is eminently calculated to sustain a failing courage.

But I have another reason for my choice. If any Church in Christendom has much to learn from the past, it is the Church of England. Three separate epochs contribute their quota for her instruction. First (*a*) there is the epoch of her own foundation; then (*b*) that of her labours for the conversion of a great portion of Europe; and, thirdly (*c*), that of her more recent efforts for the conversion of the heathen world.

1. First, I say, there is the *story of her own foundation*. Do men complain of the slow progress of modern Missions? We point in reply to the fact that from the time when the Apostle of Ireland commenced his labours till the day when the men of Sussex were gathered into the Christian fold, upwards of 250 years passed away. Do men point to the inequalities of progress which attend modern efforts, to their frequent alteration of success and failure? We ask, again, were there no vicissitudes, no impediments, no interruption, no wearisome delays, in the progress of the evangelisation of these isles of ours? Were the prospects of the Church never darkened by pagan reactions? Were saintly, zealous, and energetic workers, like Laurence and Aidan, Paulinus and Chad, Wilfred and Cuthbert, never tempted to depression and grave misgiving? Again, do we hear much of the divisions and disunion which characterise the Missions of the present day? We ask, in reply, were there no differences between the Celtic and Roman missionaries? Did *they* all speak exactly alike or think the same thing? Were there no heart-burnings, no controversies amongst them respecting points which

* Bishop Butler's Sermon before the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, Steere's *Sermons and Remains*, p. 223.

seem to us now of trivial importance, though then they stirred angry discussions? But were not these very differences overruled for good, and was not disorder gradually made to give place to order? Lastly, are we sometimes told of peoples who, while they have gained much on bowing to the yoke of Christ, yet at the same time have let go something which they might have kept? * Then we can point to the instance of the conversion of Angles and Saxons, and can say that, though this in their case seemed to be true, yet the providence of God so ordered it that the stern but needful discipline of the Dane first, and the Norman after him, restored what otherwise might have been lacking, and redressed the balance which appeared to have been disturbed.

2. Besides, however, the story of her own foundation, the Church of England can look back upon the *record of her own efforts for the conversion of the once heathen world of Switzerland and Germany, of Holland and Belgium*. How would modern Christendom have been realised at all had it not been for the labours of enthusiastic Celtic pioneers like Columbanus and Gallus, followed up by the more practical exertions of a Willibrord and a Winfrid?

But even when Teutons went forth as the "apostles of Teutons," when differences of dialect and language did little to hamper the work, when the principle of "Associated Missions" was carried out to its utmost extent, when central authority, becoming each successive century more increasingly dominant, controlled and directed Missionary movements, did our English forefathers find the work of evangelisation an easy one, even amongst their own kith and kin? There was much to warrant the expectation of speedy results. Seldom was greater energy, more complete self-devotion, more burning zeal displayed than in the history of many of the early Continental Missions.

And yet were the results achieved with that celerity which so many demand now?

The answer is ready to hand. The tenth century did not see even half the work accomplished. Fifteen centuries were destined to run their course before the whole of Europe could be said to be even nominally Christian, and in the extreme north of Europe Christianity did not become the popular religion till the sixteenth and even the seventeenth century. † A retrospect then, of past efforts made under the most favourable circumstances, remind the sons of the Church of England now that "while the life of the individual man is reckoned by decades, that of nations is estimated by centuries, that of collective humanity by thousands of years." ‡

But if the retrospect of the period when England was the missionary Church of Europe teaches us that "the Christian body is enlarged by growth and stationariness combined," § and that inex-

* Archbishop Trench's *Mediæval Church History*, p. 40.

† See Hardwick's *Church History, Middle Age*, p. 314.

‡ Carl Heinrich Plath's *Mission under Three new Aspects*, p. 83.

§ Mozley's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 112.

haustible patience must be our watchword, it reminds us also of something more. When we look back upon the record of the contact of Christianity with the peoples of Europe, we cannot fail to see that as each nation has preserved through the centuries many peculiar characteristics corresponding to the specialty and the idiosyncrasies of the country where it has its dwelling, so it has been with the various branches of the one Catholic Church established amongst these nations. Each nation has had something to give to the Church as well as to receive in the matter of faith and worship, and the experience of the past has shown that the body of Christ, as St. Paul says, "is compacted by that which *every joint* supplieth."

Surely, then, in looking forward to the future, we must get out of the habit of thinking to extend only the English Church into other countries, instead of planting in each country its own proper branch of the Church of Christ. We must remember that the Italian did not cease to be an Italian, or the German a German, or the Northman a Northman, when he became a Christian. We need not marvel, therefore, as if it were "some strange thing," but rather expect that, as it has been well said, we must become as Indians to the Indian, and as Africans to the African, if we would win India or Africa to Christ. In every country the Church must be truly a native Church, if it is to become the Church of the people; and if it is to be a native Church it must be expected to have its own special characteristics, and instead of being moulded on one uniform, exotic, Western plan, allowance must be made for peculiarities of race and character, and the unity of the Church will be no more lost amidst diversities of usages and forms of devotion than the unity of the human race is lost amidst differences of language, of customs, and of dress in different parts of the world.

3. But it remains for me to glance at the third, *or modern epoch of missionary progress*. It is a rare privilege, granted to few Churches and nations, to be twice summoned to the most momentous spiritual enterprise. But this is what has happened to the Church of England. Once largely instrumental in the conversion of Europe, she is now called to win over to the fold of Christ nations and peoples of the most diverse character and modes of life in the farthest corners of the world. Now, in reference to these recent efforts, I admit to the full the charge of apathy and indifference which may be brought against the epoch which immediately succeeded the Reformation. I admit that the records of the seventeenth do not fulfil the early promise of the sixteenth century, and the first half of the eighteenth century is not a period we can look back upon otherwise than with confusion of face. Still I do not think we sufficiently estimate the need of time for the calming down of the agitated waters of society, and I do not think we always adequately appreciate *the special grounds* for encouragement which the experience of the last hundred years affords. When has it been more signally proved than during these years that a period of delay often precedes a period of conspicuous progress? When did things look darker as regards Missionary work than in 1747, about which year

Bishop Butler is said to have declined the archbishopric of Canterbury on the ground that it was "too late for him to try and support a falling Church?"*

"*It was too late!*" The aspect of religion at home was mournful, and suggested many misgivings. What was the outlook abroad? Where, save on the smallest scale, and amidst constant discouragements, was any zeal for the cause of Missions to be detected?

But was it too late? The presence of the Bishop of Pennsylvania amongst us to-day supplies the answer. Forty years had not passed away after the great author of the "*Analogy*" uttered these boding words before the first American bishop, whose mitre is preserved an honoured relic in the library of Trinity College, New York, was consecrated at Aberdeen.

That was in 1784. It is now, not 1884, but 1878, and what have we not seen since then? The seed sown in faith has grown into a "great tree." In what were once "feeble, struggling communities, without a native episcopacy, divided in religious belief, and unconscious of their destiny, we behold a Church, vast in extent, considerable in numbers, with sixty bishops, some of them missionary bishops, with more than four thousand clergy, with multitudes of highly educated men who have passed into her fold, with converts from all sides, a Church thoroughly organised and synodically compacted."†

And what has been accomplished in the land whence the Bishop of Pennsylvania has come to us, has been accomplished in a greater or less degree in British North America, Australia, New Zealand, Africa, and "the Isles of the Sea." The bishoprics of the English colonial and missionary Churches amount to sixty-five, and names of which the author of the *Analogy* never heard—Henry Martyn and Heber, Mountain and Field, Stewart and Venables, Cotton and Milman, Armstrong and Gray, Selwyn and Patteson—are known wherever the story of missionary enterprise has gone forth.

As to India, where Christianity once made its appearance as an alien, hardly venturing to raise its head, distinguished administrators‡ now vie with each other in testifying to the changes, moral, social, and political, which have been brought about, while 10,000 native converts came in 1875 to welcome the arrival of the Prince of Wales in Tinnevely. Nay, since then what have we seen? The grievous famine, of which we were hearing last year with bated breath, was followed by an exhibition of Christian charity on an unprecedented scale, and—the story of Wilfrid and the starving natives of Sussex§ almost repeating itself—an ingathering has

* Steere's *Sermons and Remains of Bishop Butler*, p. 29; Fitzgerald's *Life*, pp. 60, 61.

† *Other Little Ships*, a Sermon at Exeter Cathedral by the Bishop of Fredericton, August 13, 1878.

‡ See Sir Bartle Frere's *Lecture*, delivered July 9, 1872; Lord Napier's *Speech* at Tanjore, October 26, 1871; the *Statement* presented to Parliament in 1873, exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress of India.

§ *Bede*, H. E., iv. 13.

followed of upwards of 20,000 into the Church of Southern India, the scene of the labours of Bishop Caldwell.*

These facts, as it seems to me, are not, on the one hand, to be *over-estimated*, and on the other hand are not to be *under-estimated*. They stand forth as distinct encouragements, and remind us that, however imposing the apparent unity of the religious life of the Middle Ages may be, what has been realised during the last hundred years is a signal proof of the continued potency of Missionary zeal, and that we may "lose the sense of the general action of the principles of Christianity in the variety of the forms through which they work." Whatever men may say, the growth of the colonial Churches during the last fifty years is one of the most cheering and convincing signs that God has not forsaken us. Their progress has not been unimpeded. On the contrary, it has been a matter of persistent struggle against opposition and difficulties of all kinds. Yet, in spite of all, the work has been carried out to a successful issue, and it is not too much to assert that the conduct and example of those who have gone forth to the arduous task of founding or building up new Churches of our communion, acting on the Church which they have left behind, have raised, almost at a bound, the level of ministerial obligation, and the *intensive* and *extensive* work of the Church have gone hand in hand.

The retrospect of past efforts is not then, I think, without its valuable lessons. It teaches us to remember that the dealings of God's Providence, especially in Mission work, are by gradual steps. It reminds us that long delay and apparent failure may often precede a period of signal success.† It bids us not misunderstand periods of transition, or despair if forms of deism or scepticism take possession for a while of minds, which a popular mythology has failed to satisfy. It warns us against hastily determining the future of Christianity and of our race by our own limited anticipations, or imagining that "the speculative East and the practical West can be made to think and express themselves exactly after the same fashion."

Whatever may be the deficiencies—and they are not a few—of modern efforts, we have on our own side much to encourage, much to nerve us for greater exertions—an energy at least equal to that of former ages, a success beyond former precedent, historical knowledge and experience, and lastly the varied influences of superior intelligence and power, of commerce and emigration, those "mixing wheels of nations."

These make up to us for much that was given in larger measure to earlier and simpler times.

Undoubtedly the older the Church grows, the more serious and difficult becomes her work—her *Diaspora* work amongst her own scattered children, her *Mission* work amongst non-Christian peoples.

* See the *Harvest—a new Movement in Tinnevely*, S.P.G. publications, March 30, 1878; and the *Extension of the Movement in Tinnevely*, August 1, 1878.

† In the case of men and of nations, the longest training and the dreariest period of abeyance of spiritual life are often preparations for its fullest growth.—Hutton's *Essays*, p. 122.

Still, what our own eyes have seen and our own ears have heard in our own generation ought to inspire hopefulness.

It is only forty years since a cloud of smoke, seen on the distant horizon from the Hudson shore, New York, told of the first steamship* that ever crossed the Atlantic Ocean.

Since then a complete revolution has taken place before our eyes, and commerce has been mixing and shaking the mass of society as it never was shaken before. "Almost all the rivers of the earth have begun," to use Karl Ritter's expression, "to run in double currents, and nearly all the seas and rivers have become the seas and rivers of civilisation."†

How Missionary enterprise shall follow in its wake is the problem of the day. But whether it does this effectually sooner or later, the history of the past assures us that it must have its tales of lights kindled and then quenched, and then relumed *quo minime reris*; its tales of "instruments changed with startling suddenness;" its tales of hopes realised in forms far out of calculation.‡ To the end it will stand in awe of the Divine Plan which so far transcends its agents, and be ever ready to take up the words—

Lord! who Thy thousand years dost wait
To work the thousandth part
Of Thy vast plan, for us create
With zeal a patient heart.

REV. T. GREEN.

OMITTING, for the sake of brevity, remarks of a general character on the subject of Missions, I proceed at once to the special topic of this paper. It seems fitting at the outset to call attention to the position which the great Head of the Church has been pleased in his providence to assign to our country in this great missionary enterprise. England occupies a place which no other nation does. The sun never sets on her dominions. One-sixth of the habitable globe, and a like proportion of its population, has been committed to our rule. We have commercial relations with all lands—our ships may be found in every port. Can we be mistaken in the belief that in promoting the spread of the gospel throughout our Colonies, and the world at large, we are fulfilling one great object for which this great empire has been entrusted to us? In reference to the condition of missions at the present time, the first thing we would notice, is, the vastness of the area the mission field embraces. The world to which the Apostle alludes, when he reminds the Colossians that the gospel has come to them, as it had come to all the world, was of comparatively limited extent, conterminous, it may be, with the Roman empire of that day. Vast as that empire was, the British

* The *Sirius*, which started from Cork April 5, and reached New York April 23, 1838.

† C. H. Plath, p. 90.

‡ Bright's *Early English Church History*, p. 52.

dominion alone is five times as large in area, and contains fully twice the population. But modern missionaries are not confined within these limits. They are entering at every door; following the footprints of every new discovery; and attempting to plant the standard of the cross amongst all the tribes and nations of the earth. The field is, literally, in the widest acceptance of the word, the world. He who walks in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks, and holds the stars in his right hand, says to the Church of our day, as He did to the Church of Philadelphia, "Behold, I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it,"—China, Japan, India in its length and breadth, Persia, Turkey, the greater part of the continent of Africa, and numerous other regions, almost, if not wholly, inaccessible a century ago, have yielded an entrance to the gospel: and wherever an opportunity has been given, some attempt has been made to enter the open door, and to proclaim "the unsearchable riches of Christ."

A second thought which suggests itself, is, the measure of success which has rested upon the work. It is fashionable in some quarters to decry and disparage the results of missionary labour. One feels disposed to ask whether any amount of success would satisfy the parties who indulge in these complaints. An important conference, attended by a large body of missionaries from every part of the world, was held in Liverpool twenty years ago. Statistics were then produced which showed that the number of converts from heathenism through the agency of modern Protestant missions, amounted to at least a million and a quarter. The ratio of increase has been as great, if not greater, since that time. On a moderate computation the number now can scarcely be less than two millions. I venture to assert that, so far as we have any data to help us in forming an estimate, the converts of the early church were not more numerous within the same period. There has been very marked progress during the last few years. Let me mention instances connected with individuals personally known to myself. Bishop Gell, of Madras, in his recent charge, states that the number of baptised Christians in his diocese had increased from 48,252 in the year 1862, to 79,917 in 1877, more than 31,000 in the short space of 15 years. Since his charge was delivered, we have heard the cheering news of the remarkable movement in Bishop Caldwell's district, some 20,000 heathen wishing to place themselves under Christian instruction, and, with the Macedonian in the Apostle's vision, crying out, "Come over and help us." Almost simultaneously more than 6,000 have expressed a similar desire in another part of Southern India. John Richard Wolfe commenced his missionary career at Fuh-chow, in the Fuh-kien province sixteen years ago. There were then only two or three converts, the fruit of the patient but apparently unrequited labours of devoted missionaries who had preceded him. There are now in that province more than 2,300 Christians, many of whom have had to stand the test of a bitter and unrelenting persecution. The Niger territory presents the example of a native church, more or less complete in its organisation, with all its officers from the bishop downwards, and all its converts, of

African descent. It was commenced twenty years ago. It now numbers upwards of nine hundred adherents. The well-known name of Duncan, of Metlahkatlah, will suggest another illustration. His missionary career extends over the same period. He commenced his work amongst a people who had never heard the name of Christ; a people sunk in the lowest depths of vice and degradation; wild, fierce, cannibal; without a written language, or the faintest sign of civilised life. Lord Dufferin recently visited the settlement. Nothing can exceed the terms of admiration he employs in describing the scenes of Christian order, peace and contentment which he witnessed. The converts number one thousand.

It would be easy, did time permit, to multiply evidences such as these of the progress of the work in almost every part of the world. I must content myself with two or three proofs of a more general nature—proofs on so large a scale, and of so much weight and importance, that even the most sceptical as to the result of modern missions, will scarcely venture to ignore or depreciate them. First, I would mention the recent conference at Lambeth, attended by 100 bishops, representing, probably, two-thirds of the entire episcopate connected, more or less directly, with our own communion. Their dioceses extend from China and Japan in the far East to British Columbia in the West, and from Rupertsland in the North to New Zealand and Australia in the South. A striking illustration, surely, of the vast area covered by missionary operations in our own day. Another, and in some respects yet more remarkable proof is suggested by the number of languages and dialects into which the sacred Scriptures have, either in whole or in part, been translated. Previous to the commencement of the Christian era, there was, strictly speaking, only one version of the Old Testament Scriptures, the Septuagint. The number of translations from that time to the beginning of the present century did not exceed fifty. The versions now in existence are more than two hundred. Who can estimate the amount of sanctified labour which has been expended by our missionary brethren upon these translations? How many busy heads and hearts have been engaged! We almost seem to realise in this fact the fulfilment of the apocalyptic vision—"And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people."

Nor must we overlook the testimony borne to missionary success by eminent civilians, and others who have had ample opportunity of judging of the results of the work within the sphere of their own observation. I can only select two or three such testimonies connected with India, a part of the mission field in which on many accounts we are naturally most interested. Lord Lawrence, our late viceroy, says—"I believe, notwithstanding all that the English people have done to benefit that country, the missionaries have done more than all other agencies combined." Sir Bartle Frere, late Governor of Bombay, remarks—"I assure you that, whatever you may be told to the contrary, the teaching of Christianity among one hundred and sixty millions of civilised industrious Hindus and Mohammedans in

* 240,000,000 according to Census

India is effecting changes, moral, social, and political, which, for extent and rapidity of effect, are far more extraordinary than anything you or your fathers have witnessed in modern Europe." Lord Northbrook, the late viceroy, on his return to England, wrote to the secretaries of the Church Missionary Society to put down his name as a subscriber of £100 a year—a practical proof of his estimate of the work.

But, it will be asked, and very properly asked, is the Christianity of our missions of a spiritual character, influencing, as far as man can judge, the heart and life; bringing the sinner in humble penitence and faith to the foot of the Cross; producing the fruits of the Spirit; and training for the happiness and enjoyments of heaven? We must not forget that, in the visible Church, the evil is ever mingled with the good; the tares and wheat grow together till the harvest; the gospel net encloses bad fish as well as good. But after a lengthened study of the subject, and a careful perusal, for some thirty or forty years past, of records of missions, I do not hesitate to declare my conviction that the Christianity of modern missions will bear comparison with that of the earliest and best periods of the Christian Church. There has been the same endurance of persecution; the same withstanding of sore and severe temptation; the same willingness to forsake all for Christ—father, mother, wife, house, land; the same holy zeal, faith, devotedness; in numerous instances, also, the same large-hearted liberality and self-denial. One prominent example may suffice in the way of illustration. The Indian Mutiny was a sifting and testing ordeal on a large scale, and of unusual severity. The results as regards the steadfastness of the converts will bear comparison with anything in any former period in the Church's history.

But it is time to pass on to the consideration of the second branch of our subject, viz., the "Organisation of Missions." A word, first, in reference to home organisation. Great liberty should ever be allowed, as has hitherto been the case, in our home operations. If there be true-hearted allegiance on the part of our missionary societies to the principles, doctrines, and discipline of our Church, it seems unwise to attempt a constrained and enforced uniformity of action. The thing is, indeed, impossible. The only result would be strife and division. The Church of Rome has in this, as in other matters, been wise in her generation. She has allowed the utmost diversity of agency and of operation compatible with a general subjection to her supreme authority. Benedictines, Dominicans, Franciscans, Augustinians, Jesuits, Friars—black, white, and grey; can all find ample room and scope for their several idiosyncracies and modes of action. We have a better precedent in the practice of the apostolic age. No impolitic restriction was then put upon the efforts of Christians to extend the gospel. There is room for all the various agencies that are at work. Let all be allowed to pursue their own course, simply striving which can be most faithful to the Master we all profess to serve—which most abundant in zeal, devotedness, and love.

With regard to the organisation of missions abroad, the views and

plans which, on the whole, commend themselves most to my own judgment are, I do not hesitate to say, those which have been adopted by the Church Missionary Society. With slight modification I present those views in its own words. "It is the principle of the society that all its evangelistic efforts should aim, first, at the conversion of individual souls; and, secondly, though contemporaneously, at the organisation of the permanent native Christian Church, *self-supporting, self-governing, self-extending*."

"1st. Self-supporting. From the first, the converts are taught the scriptural principle that 'they that preach the gospel should live of the gospel;'—that while the missionary should be maintained by the Foreign Society that sent him forth, the native pastor or teacher ought to be supported by his own people. 2nd. Self-governing. Those who raise a fund should have a voice in the administrations of it; and the members of a church in its management. Accordingly, wherever there are three or more congregations under native pastors, a native church council is formed, which undertakes the distribution of the money, and the management of purely local church affairs. Three or more district councils are combined to form a provincial council. 3rd. Self-extending. The duty of making known the gospel to their countrymen is constantly urged on the converts."

"By the methods just described, the native church is trained for independence, and for its perfected organisation hereafter under a native episcopate."

It must ever be borne in mind that our modern missions are in a transition state. As at home, so abroad, great latitude must be allowed. The principle laid down in the 34th Article of our Church is specially applicable. "It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly like: for at all times there have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's word." We must not attempt to fashion the churches of other lands after the exact pattern of our own. We expect them to hold fast all the great essentials; to maintain and abide by the canonical Scriptures; to hand down the "faith once delivered to the saints;" and, as branches of our own communion, to adhere to the three-fold order of the ministry, and to the general outline and substance of the liturgical services of the Church. More than this we have no right to expect. There must be scope for healthy development, and for the free exercise of national preferences, as well as native energy in all matters of indifference. In such matters the scriptural rubrics prescribe the only really necessary limit. "Let all things be done decently and in order." "Let all things be done to edifying." With one concluding remark I leave this topic. Great forbearance is due from those called to the highest office of our Church in missionary spheres towards men who have long borne the burden and heat of the day. It is unwise, not to say cruel, to attempt by a stretch of episcopal authority to interfere with, and even set aside, plans which are the result of mature and lengthened experience, and which in no wise trench upon the just limits of established order and usage.

The concluding topic to which our attention is invited is, the "Prospects of Missions." Our expectations must be formed and regulated in accordance with the teaching of Holy Scripture, and the lessons of past experience. We cannot look for unvarying success, and we may not even hope to retain continued hold of every conquest which has been gained. The light of many an ancient city and province has flickered and died away. An absolutely pure Church during the present dispensation is an idle dream. In too many instances gross corruptions have contaminated the one true faith. The path of the Church has not hitherto been that of the triumphant conqueror who subjects every realm to his sway, and retains every province he has once acquired; but rather, in too many cases, that of the pilgrim who goes forth, staff in hand, sojourning sometimes for a longer, sometimes a shorter period, here or there, but diffusing and scattering abroad blessings on every side wherever he is permitted to tarry. Such, we may expect, will continue to be the Church's experience to the close of the present dispensation. The sure word of prophecy, and the parables of our Lord, do not permit us to anticipate a world converted by the gospel and subject to Christ before His second and glorious advent. But every onward step we take: every mission we plant: every heathen we win: every wanderer we reclaim: every soul savingly converted to the Redeemer, hastens the hoped-for consummation. We confer blessings untold upon the individual, village, city, nation, that receives the message with which we are entrusted: and the Church, like another John the Baptist, is preparing the way of the Lord, and ushering in that time when all the predictions of the latterday glory of the world will be realised. The Saviour shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass, as showers that water the earth. He shall have the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession. The knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth, as the waters cover the sea. The trumpet of the seventh angel shall sound, and there shall be great voices in heaven saying, "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our God and of his Christ, and He shall reign for ever and ever." In anticipation of a prospect so glorious and blessed, may not the Church urge her members to increase their efforts and zeal, adopting the language of the Apostle as he anticipated the joy of the resurrection morn—"Be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord."

ADDRESSES.

The Right Rev. W. WEST JONES, D.D., Lord Bishop of Capetown.

I KNOW not why I should have been chosen to speak first on this occasion, except that it was supposed by those who drew up the scheme of speakers that I could adduce something out of my own experience of the mission field. There are

others in this country who have watched the course of events far longer than I have, and are more competent to speak of the general missionary work and enterprise of the Church of England; and therefore I shall take the liberty of confining my remarks to my own experience in missions, and to the condition and prospects of the Church with which I am more immediately connected. Before going further, I wish to say, as one of the bishops visiting England this year, that our hearts have been gladdened by seeing all around us signs of a great and growing interest in this country in mission work. This is seen not only in the days of intercession, which have become so regularly and attentively observed, but we see on every side indications of missionary interest in such forms as parochial and diocesan organisations, associations for the support of missionary candidates, gatherings for missionary purposes in the cathedrals of many of your dioceses, and above all, perhaps, in the interest we see taken by the audiences, large or small, who assemble to learn what has been done in the mission field. The first thing I want to say is this, that although, as a general rule, it is perfectly clear that as a colonial Church grows in strength and age, it ought to be self-supporting, yet each Church should be tried by its own merits, to stand or fall according to the way in which it deals with the circumstances, in which it finds itself placed. There is, I am afraid, a tendency in England to deal with all colonial Churches by a Procrustean rule, and to say that every Church, after it has been in existence so many years, ought to be self-supporting, without taking into account the special circumstances of each colony, or settlement, or province. No doubt those containing mainly an English population ought to be self-supporting after a certain number of years, but I am going to speak of colonies where that is not the case. With regard to those in South Africa, and the province over which I have been called by God to preside, it must never be forgotten that the Church has to deal with large native populations and a very small English population. Besides this, in the Cape colony, and the colonies adjoining it, an overwhelming majority of white men belongs to religious communions alien to our own. It must not therefore be supposed that because the Church in South Africa has been founded so many years—because there has been in that country an English colony for 70 years or more—and because there has been a bishop, or rather several bishops, in that country for a period extending from 1847 to the present time—that therefore now it ought necessarily to be able to support itself. We are a poor colony. We have great difficulty in providing for our own spiritual ministrations, and we have still greater difficulty in providing the means for the extension of the Gospel amongst the heathen in the midst of whom we live. The members of the Dutch Reformed Church alone outnumber the members of the Church of England in my diocese by four or five, or even six to one, and therefore it must not be considered that because the English colony has been in existence for 70 years, it is time the Church in it should be entirely self-supporting. You must remember that emigration from England to our colony has been very, very much smaller than to almost any other colony in the British Empire. My object is to plead for the continuance of England's interest in colonial missions upon two of the grounds set forth in the programme—their condition and their prospects. I omit the second, viz., that of organisation. I have already spoken of one special reason why we in South Africa ask for a continuance of support from friends in England, namely, the small number of the members of our Church. We have only 10,000 English people belonging to the Church in my diocese, and perhaps 20,000 natives, and I hope you will consider it a fair proof of the efforts we are making ourselves when I tell you that in the last three years, during which I have been bishop of the diocese, we have raised £10,000 a year towards the maintenance of our Church work. But we plead for help on special and new grounds. First of all, the Colonial Government has lately passed a law by which all State aid, amounting with respect

to our Church to about £2,600, is to be withdrawn from us by degrees, as vested interests fall in. Again, we ask for continued help on the ground that there has been, as most of you know, a most unprecedented drought in the country for two years, bringing great loss upon the population generally, so that those amongst whom the Church and her missionaries labour in many cases lost the whole of their means of subsistence. Thirdly, I ask for continued assistance because we have had on the frontier for the last year or two a war which has immensely increased the taxation on all our people. If we have not been able to do in times past what we wished to do when the colony was more prosperous, what can we do now, when times are harder and prospects less favourable? So much for our present condition. I now pass on to our prospects. I plead, then, still more for help on account of the great openings for the spread of the Gospel, which in the providence of God have just been made. There has been a large district of the size of France added to the British Empire—the Transvaal—a country which, I am persuaded, when labour is easier to obtain and transport less difficult, will be found to possess grand and magnificent resources. The mineral and agricultural wealth of that country is large and extensive, and it only requires communication with the sea to make it one of the most prosperous countries in the world. A bishop has indeed lately been sent out to that country, but what do I find? In a territory the size of France there were only five clergymen, and two more he has found to accompany him, but “what are they among so many?” England is sending out emigrants, and will be sending out more in increased numbers to occupy the land; but all that the Church can now do is to provide for them a bishop and seven clergymen. Then, what an opening there is in Kaffraria! What will be the effect of the great war on the frontier now drawing to a close? It will, I believe, result in the tribal system being broken up, and the people will no longer be subject to their chiefs, but come directly under the influence of the British Government; magistrates will be planted in the midst of them, and we shall see a great increase amongst them of the arts of civilisation and industry. We shall then have only, in the words of Caleb, to “go up at once and possess the land,” and carry the light of the Gospel into its dark places. Then, again, there is another remarkable opening—that in Zululand. You have doubtless seen by the newspapers that there are threatenings of even more serious disturbances in that country, and I am afraid if we had war with the Zulus, it would be found more trying and disastrous than that with the Kaffirs. Some time ago there were hopes that the Zulu King would become a Christian, as he seemed to show signs of a desire to do so; but I believe he only made this show to carry out the better his own secret purposes, and pretended that there was some likelihood of his becoming a Christian to conciliate the British Government. He now has thrown off the mask, and is cruelly persecuting our missionaries. He is not taking their lives, but he has taken the lives of some of their converts, and is making it almost impossible for any Christian to live in the country. Zululand adjoins Natal, and if it must come to a war, and God should bless our arms and give us the victory, we must go in and possess that land also, spiritually as well as territorially, in the name of Christ, not only in the name of England. These openings bring us nearer and nearer to Central Africa, and to that spot on the Zambesi river sacred and dear to the hearts of English Churchmen, where a few short years ago his mourning fellow-labourers reverently laid the body of the sainted Mackenzie. North of that spot the Zambesi mission is now carrying on its work; and we hope that in God’s good time we may push up northward and they come down from Zanzibar southward, until we join in planting the banner of the Cross on the Zambesi, at the grave of Mackenzie. All this can only be done by a great increase in the staff of workers. Lastly, I entreat you not to look upon missionary labour and enterprise as something which you

are bound to undertake, as a matter of hard duty as Christians, but one which everyone who bears the name of Christ should feel it to be a privilege and a delight to forward and to take part in, whether by prayer, or labour, or almsgiving. It is a work which the Lord hath not chosen to do by overwhelming displays of His power, nor entrusted wholly to the angels, who always serve Him. He might, had He so willed it, have passed us altogether by, as unworthy to take a part in so glorious and so heavenly a work, but in His mercy He has deigned to make us fellow-workers with Himself, and has attached to faithful labour the promise of an exceeding great reward. "They that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars for ever and ever."

REV. J. F. FENN.

My Lord Archbishop, with your Grace's permission I will confine myself to one part of the subject on the paper, namely, the "Organisation of Native Churches in Heathen or other non-Christian Countries." It seems to me, in the first place, that there is a danger of misunderstanding the word "organisation," as though it denoted some sort of mechanical arrangement of things, something which is, or which tends to be, dry and stiff and lifeless. Now, in fact, there can be no true organisation where there is no organic life. It is so in the constitution of the Church, and of every part of it. If there is life present and active in the Church, there can and will be organisation. Now the life of the Church is the result of the life-giving energy of the Holy Spirit; and from his presence and work the whole outward order of the Church must spring. From this follows the principle of organisation of native Churches for which I plead, namely, the principle of the true Christian liberty. I take my stand on words which the Lord Archbishop has quoted from the Report of the Lambeth Conference of Bishops:—"We assert the just liberties of particular or national Churches." On the analogy of this assertion I claim the just freedom of development in the organisation of native Churches in non-Christian countries. Let me remind you of the condition in which these communities of native Christians are found at the time when this development has become possible and desirable. At this early period of their history we have in them the juxtaposition of two very different elements, one of which never can be a constituent part of the native Church. This extraneous or foreign element is the foreign missionary body, both the controlling power at home, and the missionary staff in the field. The other element, out of which the native Church must be formed, consists of the native Christians, and of the native agents, catechists and readers, schoolmasters and teachers, and native pastors. Now, in all the early period of missionary work, this juxtaposition is a state of dependence of the one on the other, which tends to be prolonged beyond the legitimate time of its continuance, and which may be hurtful and mischievous. For consider the early process through which the Christian community has passed. It has illustrated the principles of Church order which are stated in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. It has been a "calling out" from the surrounding sin and darkness and misbelief. Its true converts have been convinced of sin and have repented. They have found Christ the Saviour of sinners. They have been baptised in this faith, and have been taught by their missionary teachers, to a certain extent, at all events, to observe the things which our Lord taught his Apostles. They have adhered to the teaching which at first came through the Apostles of Christ, and which has come to them through their missionary teachers. They have adhered to the fellowship and new association into which they have been called. They have learned also to adhere to the breaking of bread and to

common prayers under the same guidance. But all this has been very strikingly a calling out from their old associations. And almost inevitably the separating side of this work leaves a deeper impression on their minds than the new companionship into which they have been called. And so their Christian state tends at least to be a kind of individualised and separate condition. Now this is not organisation. It is an imperfect, because unduly dependent, condition of things. It is not growing up into a perfect man, into the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. Still the Holy Ghost works in them. And where He works the fellowship which is his characteristic must work too. Christ, the Head of the Church, is in them, and with them. And where He works there must necessarily be a growing and deepening unity. It is an interesting fact, so far as we learn, at all events in the missions of the Church Missionary Society, that this organisation begins to develope when the one element of Church order which is missing in the enumeration already drawn from the early Pentecostal period is brought into active exercise. You will remember that in the second chapter of the Acts this element is brought prominently forward after the preceding ones have been described. I mean systematic, regular, and recognised almsgiving. As soon as this arises in a native Church, administration begins; the various functions of government, lay as well as clerical, come into exercise. And then can the closing sentence of the second chapter of the Acts be realised:—"The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved." Now what I plead for is, that no arbitrary restraint be placed on the free movement which the Holy Spirit would give to these developing energies. The organising power which he exerts must be watched and obeyed in its own true action. If we look to the condition of modern missions, we shall see illustrations of the account which I have given. The sense of dependence, discouraged from the headquarters at home, holds its place in the native Church until it has been earnestly and persistently counteracted. It is a simple matter of fact that the Church Missionary Society urges forward this true development of the native Church, and fosters and encourages every effort to administer and to control internal affairs within the community. Its missionaries, indeed, are English Churchmen, and are bound by the laws and regulations of the Church of which they are members and ministers. They are under the lawful authority of the bishops whose licences they hold. And the Lord Archbishop has told us to-day that the society has accepted the determinations of the bishops assembled at Lambeth as to the position in which the missionaries stand to their own bishops. But the society seems to me to claim for the native Church all that freedom which the Spirit of God demands. And it urges on the members of the native Church to submit to his organising energy in the way in which He would mould and direct the circumstances and the conditions of their social, national, and Church life. There are two practical inferences which I would draw from this view of missionary work. First, I ask my younger brethren whether it does not present to their minds an attractive sphere of work for Christ? There must be many among them who are worthily conscious that God has given them powers of organisation, but to whom the Church at home may not for some time to come offer any adequate scope for the exercise of those powers. In the native Churches in the non-Christian lands they may be called to exercise these functions at an age at which they might not find positions of equal importance at home. Secondly, I ask myself and my fellow Churchmen this question, "If to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places" is made known "through the Church the manifold wisdom of God," surely we English Churchmen may learn inestimably precious lessons about the many-sided multitudinous wisdom of God from the varied history of the native Churches, organised under the varied movements of the one free Spirit of God in the wide area of his mission field.

Rev. Canon BAILEY, D.D., late Warden of St. Augustine's,
Canterbury.

I AM well aware that the chief reason of my being asked to address this great Congress on this occasion is not any personal merit of mine, but the fact that for nearly thirty years I have had the administration from its infancy of the great Missionary College of St. Augustine at Canterbury, and, therefore, may be supposed during that time to have enjoyed large opportunities of becoming acquainted with the working of the Missions of the Church. And so, indeed, it has been; and in this place I may be allowed to add that my interest and belief in Missions did not begin even with those thirty years, but that in a manner I inherited them, for the first four ordained missionaries of the Church Missionary Society received their early training in the Sunday-schools of my great-uncle and godfather in this my native county of Yorkshire. Well, then, I read the topic which is now before us, "Foreign and Colonial Missions; their condition, organisation, and prospects;" and, as I read it and am asked to speak upon it, I take it to be a call upon me, not for arguing the subject, not for information, not for exhortation, not even for evidence; but simply for my verdict, as it may be compressed within a quarter of an hour, on the points which the topic embraces. It must, of course, be a verdict founded upon facts. And the first fact I notice is, the position to which the subject of Missions generally has attained in the mind and practical life of the Church. It has struggled up, through much discouragement, above almost universal ridicule and contempt. It has struggled above party, beyond the limits of any voluntary society, above mere uninstructed zeal, into the highest seats of learning at our Universities, into the programme of Church Congresses, into the debates of Convocation. It has been the cause of two Lambeth Conferences of Bishops gathered together from the ends of the earth. Its importance is recognised in secular newspapers and literature, and in the Blue-books of Government. Such strength of position has it reached, that it can welcome criticism, and can well afford to look defects in the face, and boldly remove them. Some of the grandest men of the last generation were those who had devoted their energies to Mission work. Need I name more than two, Samuel Marsden, son of the Yorkshire blacksmith, apostle of New Zealand, and him who has but just now been taken from a mourning Church, Bishop Selwyn? The next fact I observe is the marvellous extent and range of the Mission field, for there is not a colony, or region of a colony, not a heathen dependency, hardly a heathen country, in any part of the world, where the Church has not now her missionary operations. No sooner is Cyprus thought to be open for them than the Bishop of Gibraltar hastens to survey the ground. More marvellous still is the rapidity with which these operations have attained their present condition. The interval is less than a life-time. No longer ago than 1830 Dr. Duff first went out to India, and records, "It was a great thing to get a pupil of respectable caste or parentage to come out to a school at all. It was looked upon as an absurd scheme, as a wild and visionary project, and a proof of downright folly to expect it; it was talked of as Thomas More's Utopia. They laughed at me. I commenced my humble operations with five; but I said I am ready to begin with one." You have, therefore, materials for your verdict on foreign and colonial Missions, with *à priori* considerations of their extent, variety, and rapid growth. But now we have to combine with these other considerations *à posteriori*, after inquiry into their condition. Of course this is a complex inquiry, far beyond my present power, as our Missions are of such various dates, and carried on under such diverse circumstances. It depends, too, on the criterion by which we judge.

If we ask whether their condition is worthy of the Church of England, whose Missions they are, I say most unhesitatingly and with sorrow, it is most unworthy, when we consider the wealth, the opportunities, and the consequent duties of the mother Church; but, if we take as the criterion the paucity of the numbers of the agents she has sent out, the slender abilities of many of them, the shortness of the time they have been at work, the difficulties of climate and of language they have had to contend with, then I do say the condition of our Missions in foreign parts is really wonderful, and their work genuine, solid, and growing. I take up and read letters, reports, documents of all sorts, and I observe pervading them, and in every quarter, zeal, devotedness, simplicity, earnestness, discontent with present results, striving after more and higher. I remember some years ago hearing an eminent layman, who had had large opportunities of judging of our Missions in India, Sir Arthur Cotton, make the observation at a public meeting that missionaries understated the results of their work rather than overstated them. That remark was contrary to the general opinion: it was new even to myself; but I have often tested it since, and I believe it to be thoroughly true. Taught by long and close experience, missionaries have learned to distrust appearances, and to hesitate before they pronounce a favourable judgment. If from a general survey of the condition of foreign missions, we come to particular instances, I would ask you what you think of the condition of the field of Tinnevely, where more than 20,000 have this year asked to be received into the Church? What of the field in Ahmednagar, cultivated by former pupils of my own, where one of them (thank God!) has recently baptised, as only a selection, 1,500 converts? These you may say are bright exceptions. Well, then, take another class of Missions, worked under the greatest disadvantages, and rather little thought of—those in Kaffraria. So dispassionate and capable a judge as Sir Bartle Frere, after a sojourn in that region, declared lately at a public meeting in Capetown that the missionaries there were producing the same results as the missionaries in the fourth and later centuries. Next, I am called on for a verdict upon the organisation of Missions. I take it to be a most remarkable sign of the advance in the divinely-taught science of Missions, that this should be made the subject of special inquiry. For time was, and not long since, when “organisation” was a thing disparaged, and reckoned as savouring of formalism and unspiritual views; when individual piety was looked at as the sole and simple end to be attained; when teaching and preaching constituted all the missionary’s work. Time was when the very name “synod” was suspected as something very terrible; when the collection of offerings in the Church’s authorised way was supposed—I never could understand why—to smack of Popery; when women’s work in the Mission field was a thing spoken of in this wise, as it was by good Bishop Wilson, of Calcutta—“I imagine that no unmarried female would have thought, in the Apostles’ days, of a voyage of 14,000 miles to find out a scene of duty.” Thank God! we have since then better learnt the nature of the Kingdom of Christ. Thank God! we have learnt that “the holy Catholic Church” is the very next article of the Apostles’ Creed to “the Holy Ghost.” We have learnt that the article of the holy Catholic Church carries with it all the questions of constitution, government, discipline, rites, ceremonies. And now, for our verdict on the organisation of Missions, we have before us the facts that they *are* more or less actually organised by means of various machinery, and that such machinery is in progress of being brought gradually to perfection. There are synods provincial and diocesan, diocesan conferences, diocesan societies, rural deaneries, establishments of missionary centres, working arrangements from those centres, missionary brotherhoods, missionary sisterhoods, medical missions, methods for fusing into one spiritual body the various elements and nationalities of the population of the Mission field. Now, when I observe organisation of Missions going on and consoli-

dating the whole missionary body, my verdict is a favourable and hopeful one. Lastly, for the prospects of Missions. The verdict on this head will, no doubt, be according to our faith. Some will predict failure, and that with a sneer. Such are those who do not believe, and who do not wish to believe, the Word of God. I avow myself to be a believer in Missions. Many other promises in the Bible are contingent; those of the success of Missions are absolute (see Ps. ii. 8). Shall our Missions of the Church of England share in the inheritance of such promises as this? If, as I believe of them, they are well founded, and faithfully conducted, then they will. Of course we must give time, we must allow for difficulties, we must expect opposition and some persecution, if the religion propagated be that of a crucified Saviour. You have my verdict of the present. The verdict of the future must depend, under God, upon ourselves. It is we who, each in our measure, shall make their prospects, or shall mar them; according, that is, to our piety or our impiety, our unity or our divisions, our zeal or our apathy, our exertions or our indolence, our liberty or our niggardliness, our prayers or our neglect of prayer, our faith or our unbelief.

DISCUSSION.

Rev. T. P. HUGHES, Missionary of the Church Missionary Society
at Peshawur.

I SHOULD scarcely have ventured to address the Congress on this occasion had there been any representative amongst the speakers of that insignificant body to which I belong, namely the missionaries to the heathen. I have been much struck by the patient way in which the previous readers and speakers have treated our past failures, and also with the very happy way in which they alluded to our past and present successes. No one who has read the history of modern missions can doubt that a great change has come over the mind of the Church of England with reference to them within the last few years. A sign of this is found in the fact that so prominent a place is given to the subject of missions in this Congress. There is, however, one danger in this increased interest, and that is, that you at home are likely to dictate to the foreign missionaries too much as to the way in which they are to carry on their work abroad. The people in India travel by bullock carts, you in England by express trains; and there is a danger of your running your express trains into our slow bullock carts. I do not speak with reference to any particular party in the Church (I look on the sacred work of missions as something far above party feeling), but I allude to the great desire which is evinced by people, of all parties, for increased organisation in our foreign missions. I think you at home are likely to err in that respect. I do not mean to say that there cannot be independent native churches in some parts of India and in other countries—Tinnevely, for example—but I think it would be a great mistake to attempt to force independent organisation upon missionary churches in general. I speak with some little authority as regards India, having travelled 2,000 miles from Calcutta to my own station at Peshawur, and again 2,000 miles to Bombay, and that on several occasions. There are in our native Churches in India some elements of danger. You have in the English Church the 39 Articles and a Protestant Prayer Book, which you did not gain without severe struggles, and I am sure none of you would venture to suggest alterations or amendments to that Prayer Book, or to those Articles without very great consideration; but in attempting to force a separate organisation upon the native Churches in India, you may expect that these native Churches will also attempt a revision of their Prayer Book and of their Articles.

For example, in the native Church in relation to one doctrinal question there are two elements of danger. The converts of the native Church in India come from Hinduism on the one side, and Mohammedanism on the other; and therefore, whenever the question of the Divinity of our Blessed Lord or the doctrine of the Holy Trinity shall be discussed in a native Church Council, the converts from Mohammedanism will discuss it from an Arian, and the converts from Hinduism from a Gnostic point of view. I therefore venture to suggest to this large assembly that there is no question affecting missions which will have to be approached with greater caution than that of organisation. What we want at the present moment is not so much organisation, as increased money and increased men. To use the words of a great missionary, whose personal friendship I had the privilege of enjoying, and whose open grave I wept over—Bishop Milman, “the cry comes from our stations as agonizing as ever—send us more men!” If you will on this occasion rather direct your attention to the great and exceeding need of our mission stations than to the question of organisation, and send us out more able men to take charge of our schools, more zealous missionaries to engage in the work of preaching the gospel, you will not have met in vain in support of foreign missions.

The Right Rev. Bishop RYAN.

I DESIRE to say a few words with regard to a principle which has been noticed several times in the course of this discussion. I entirely agree with Mr. Hughes as to the position in which he is placed, but it must be remembered that there are missions—and missions. The native Churches are in different degrees of historic progress, just as in the same way nations rise into importance gradually; and it may therefore be quite true that Mr. Hughes has need of men and money, while it is not less true that at the present moment the want of organisation is, in such districts for instance as Tinnevely, one of our most pressing missionary needs. With regard to the principle to which I have referred, I have been very glad in the papers read and speeches made to hear allusions to the objection continually raised against missions that their progress is so slow. That matter has been very ably handled by Dr. Maclear. But I would ask, in talking about the harvest, what is the picture put before us of the progress of that harvest by the Lord of the harvest himself? He said that the kingdom of Heaven is “as if a man should cast seed into the ground, and should sleep and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up he knoweth not how.” It would seem to a man who knew not what would follow, that seed thrown on the ground was wasted, and particularly when the frosts and snows of winter covered it in; but after a time he would see the little tender blade pushing through the earth, and it would grow—first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear, and at length men put in the sickle because the harvest is ripe. This similitude is one particularly applicable to mission work, and I will mention one or two instances. You have all heard of Samuel Marsden, chaplain in New South Wales, who went to New Zealand for the express purpose of sowing the seed; but the Lieutenant-Governor would not give him leave at first, because news had just been received of the loss of a ship, and out of 71 people in it, 69 had been killed and devoured. He persevered, and at length he was landed on the very spot, and he speaks of his feelings of depression when he found himself seated in the midst of the very savages who had so shortly before killed and eaten some of his own countrymen. The first service he held was on Christmas Day, 1815, and for 13 years afterwards not a single soul was converted; and yet in 1842 Bishop Selwyn wrote home that New Zealand was the ground-plot of the most signal

mercies that God had ever vouchsafed to the missionary efforts of His Church. What is the state of things now? There are six dioceses, six cathedral churches, many parish churches, and a system of schools which those who know best say are more commensurate with the population than the schools in England. Here there was slow growth, but steady progress. Again, those who have seen the poor captives just as they are landed at the depôts from slave ships, know that they are not only most intensely wretched, but that they present to human sight the most unpromising soil for the Gospel seed. All they know of Christianity is that the white men have taken them from their homes, other white men have fought and rescued them. Amongst these on the Western Coast of Africa missionaries laboured under great discouragement; and after they had done so for twelve years the Rev. Edward Bickersteth went out to inspect the work, when he administered the Holy Communion and had only six communicants. After a while Mr. Johnson's converts built a church and schools, and there were at one celebration 400 communicants. If you refer to Sierra Leone now, you will find Churches not only self-supporting, but sending out missions to other parts. There a little boy, whose parents had been kidnapped, was taken on board one of Her Majesty's ships, and when in the cabin ran into a dark corner to hide himself; but that little boy is now Bishop of the Niger, with twenty-six native clergymen helping him to do the work of Christ. I will not read an extract from the *Edinburgh Review* to show the difficulties which were raised in 1807 to the missionary movement, but I may state that that publication jeeringly remarked that only ninety-eight converts had been the result of the labours of the missionaries in Bengal during a long period, and the dangers of our Empire in consequence of the movement were eloquently dwelt upon. But looking at the April number of the *Quarterly Review* in the year 1875, page 377, there is a very different tale. It states that "The Government of India, without pronouncing any opinion on the matter, cannot but acknowledge the great obligation under which it is laid by the benevolent exertions of the 600 missionaries labouring in that country, whose blameless examples and self-denying labours are infusing new vigour into the stereotyped life of the great population placed under English rule, and are preparing them to be in every way better men and better citizens of the great empire in which they dwell."

TUESDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 1st.

The Right Hon. and Most Rev. the LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK
took the Chair at 7.30 PM.

MODERN DOUBTS AND DIFFICULTIES IN RELATION TO REVEALED RELIGION.

PAPERS.

Rev. Professor WATKINS, Warden of St. Augustine's College,
Canterbury.

FROM the day on which I accepted the invitation of the committee to offer to this Congress some remarks on "Modern Doubts and Difficulties in Relation to Revealed Religion," I have taken every opportunity which presented itself of inquiring, from persons most likely to know, what these modern doubts and difficulties are. The

result of my inquiries—and I say it with serious earnestness—is that I know of none. That there are doubts in the minds of many thinkers with regard to revealed truth ; that there are difficulties in the path which intelligent faith must tread ; that these doubts are with something of the positiveness, and with something also of the shallowness of our own day, asserted as though they were certainties ; that these difficulties are too often with a culpable thoughtlessness placed as stumbling-blocks in the way of the soul seeking for its God—all this I know, as every man must know whose experience has brought him into contact with any considerable portion of the thought-currents which are flowing around and beneath us. But that these doubts and difficulties are in themselves essentially modern ; that they are anything more than the ghosts of foes slain by our forefathers, taking shape in modern scientific terms ; that they are in reality anything more than the doubts and difficulties which in every age have come to the mind, trying to think out the problem of its existence, this I do *not* know ; and this I know the less, the more I inquire into the present and the past.

I shall not, therefore, seek in your presence to slay the oft-times slain. Our armoury is abundantly stocked with weapons for doing so, and is accessible to us all. Nor shall I seek to deal with the many forms in which old difficulties are now clothing themselves. I cannot, indeed, claim to be a child of the higher criticism, or to have any such wide and accurate knowledge of the latest scientific investigations as to warrant my discussing them. There are those to follow me who have, and so far as they bear upon the present question I doubt not that they will be fully and justly dealt with. But my own experience leads me to think that the so-called scientific difficulties are not those which now press on men most heavily. The time has passed when it was possible to send a shock through the minds of thousands of pious Christians by calling attention to the fact that the Mosaic cosmogony was not expressed in the technical phraseology of the nineteenth century ; and men do not now feel startled, nor fear that some Christian doctrine is at stake, when they hear that the Sinaitic MS. has a reading varying from that of the received text. The time has passed, too, if it ever really existed, when men accepted scientific hypotheses as final truths. The temper of present thought, at least, will not bear the ascription of infallibility even to the popes of science ; and to claim it is but to bring to the front a host of protestants, who find in the conflicting assertions of different writers, or the changing opinions of the same writer, proof that even material phenomena may sometimes be misread, and that generalisations from them may be sometimes too hastily drawn. All true thinkers are, moreover, becoming impatient of the modern restriction of the word “ science ” to inductions from these material phenomena, and of the term “ fact ” to those things which the eye can see and the hand can handle. They know that there is a science of mind no less certain than that of matter, and a spiritual experience not less real, but more real than that which is natural. They know that there are such things as hopes and fears, and feelings and beliefs, and thoughts and convictions ; and they know that these

are facts, and facts having a more important bearing upon their lives than any facts of the outer world. They are becoming content, therefore, to allow the physical investigator to do his work and to say his say. In so far as this work is done reverently, and the results stated with the humility which characterises the true student, they are ready with open hand to welcome both the worker and his work, and to bid him God-speed as one of the too few who are taking from the ignorance of, and adding to the knowledge of, the human race. But the liberty which they allow, they also claim; and they reject as wholly unscientific the attempt to ignore supersensible facts, and to base all knowledge upon a practical denial of them. Seeking to base their own theory of being upon definitely ascertained mental facts, they find as the most universal fact of human life a belief in the existence of a Divine Being. For our present purpose we are entitled to assume this as acknowledged, but it may be convenient that the assumption should be made in words which by an almost open secret are known to come from two of the most eminent physicists of our day. "Let us begin," say the authors of *The Unseen Universe*, "by stating at once that we assume, as absolutely self evident, the existence of a Deity who is the Creator of all things." Now, with this fact meeting men in the constitution of their own minds and in every record of the human mind in the past, read in every language which has crystallised past thought, found among all peoples of whom present discovery has made them aware, the first question which presses for solution is the relation of the thinking mind to the Divine Being whom it necessarily thinks. For the believer in the Christian revelation this question has been for ever settled. But there are two currents of thought which have become and are now becoming prominent among us, which are constantly leading to a re-statement of the question; and it is in connection with these that the real burden of "doubts and difficulties in relation to revealed religion" is being felt. There is, on the one side, the tendency to deny the possibility of any revelation from God or any true knowledge of Him; there is on the other side—error ranking itself as always on the extremes of truth—the tendency to regard Christianity as one among many revelations, more perfect, indeed, than many which have preceded it, less perfect than others which are to follow it. These are the currents which, I am profoundly convinced, are influencing no small part of the best intellectual life and energy of our country; it is these which our teaching must stem if we are really to preach a revelation from God to man. Bear with me if I further express my conviction that they are to be stemmed not by argument, but by life; not by theories, but by practice; not by seeing faults in our foes, but by searching for them in ourselves; and bear with me if, because I have this conviction, I refer but briefly to the dangers which must be but too well known, and somewhat more at length to the safeguards which are but too often forgotten.

The first of the tendencies which I referred to has come to us in its modern form from parents, who would have been slow to recognise it as their offspring. The greatest of the Scotch philosophers, and the most learned, if not the greatest, of the English philosophers

of this century, alike held and taught that the Infinite was unknowable by the human intellect. The one is said to have frequently asserted, the other taught in words of definite meaning, that what the mind could not grasp intellectually it could lay hold of by the faculty of faith. The Absolute cannot be reached by thought: God is known only by revelation. It was but a step from this position—whether legitimate or not it is beyond my present purpose to inquire—to deny both faculties alike. God cannot be reached by thought: God cannot be known by revelation. And this Agnosticism—for the tendency has become a system, with a formal title and many disciples—is presented to us as the highest development of modern thought; and to be a true Agnostic is the highest aim of not a few of both teachers and taught in colleges and halls devoted by our forefathers to the establishment of learning, virtue, and religion. The secrets of the power by which this system has gained its hold over men are not far to seek. The region of the mysterious has for the young thinker a fascination like that which the peak of the cloud-capped mountain has for the young athlete. The student's devotion to one line of thought and reading, for which the mind has had little preparation, necessarily unfits him for a true estimate of the whole world of thoughts beyond. He cannot pass beyond the narrow limits of his own or his tutor's theories; while the masses of mankind are living in life's problems, and, living in them, are solving them. Most minds in the crisis which they pass through, as boyhood expands to manhood, are brought into contact with some of the doubts and difficulties of which we have been thinking. What if there be this solution to them all? Hard is it to know God. Easy is it to do as others have done, and seek to rest in the assertion that God cannot be known. Most men, also, as they have passed through this crisis, have realised the fearful darkness cast over their whole being by sin. The God of their childhood, of whom they learned, and to whom they lisped in prayer by mother's knee, has seemed to be further and further from them, because they have gone further and further from Him. But there are intervals in their intellectual selfism when the higher nature asserts itself; there are lulls in the storm of passion when the "still small voice" of God is heard speaking to their souls. But that voice—how awful is it! Gladly would they "say to the mountains, Fall on us; and to the hills, Cover us." What if a friendly Agnosticism can cast over them the shield of its darkness, promising the troubled mind rest, even if it be the darkness and the rest of spiritual death? They say, "Peradventure the darkness shall cover me," but 'to Him the darkness and light are both alike.'

I know not if there exist a true Agnostic—a man without the faculty for knowing God. There are men and women deprived of one or other of the senses; there are men and women deprived of reason. They are the objects of the compassion of every heart. There may be men and women deprived of—who have deprived themselves of—the higher spiritual faculty. If such there be, let them, too, be the objects of our compassion, but let them not seek to be our guides. A consistent Agnosticism should at least be dumb. I know not if

to any minds Agnosticism can bring the rest of which it speaks. I do know that some minds, in making the trial, have sunk in blank despair beneath the burden, until the light of reason itself has been quenched before its awful darkness. I do know that others, after making the trial, have been saved as by fire, and will bear, as long as life shall continue, the marks of the fearful ordeal through which they have passed. I do know that the gospel of Agnosticism is a bitter mockery of mankind, and that the hearts of the people, in their need and sorrow and sin, longing for a Father's comfort and support and forgiveness—in their joy and gratitude hymning a Father's love—can never offer their sacrifice of prayer and praise on an altar raised—"Αγνώστῳ Θεῷ"—to an Unknown God.

The other tendency to which I referred is one which has grown up among us during the last few years, and is destined, probably, to be much more powerful in the next generation than it is now. It arises in part from our insular position in the past, and will come more and more to the front as the discoveries of science and the march of civilisation connect us more closely with the brotherhood of mankind. It will be more painfully felt, too, if it is guided by men less learned, less reverential, less Christian than those who are now its leaders. But, in any case, the study of Ethnic Faiths and the science of Comparative Religion must be attended with difficulty and be fraught with danger. The deepest thoughts and feelings of the inmost heart—and these constitute a man's religion—escape observation, and are outside the domain of experiment. You cannot arrange them in a cabinet, and you cannot analyse them in a crucible. The root of a word may represent the fossil of a life which it is interesting for us to examine; but the life itself has gone, and the life was the religion. There must, moreover, be always a twofold danger even when we have arrived at correct knowledge of the religions of mankind. On the one hand, many of us have been trained in schools of thought which, based upon misinterpretation of the words of Christ and His Apostles, have taught us to believe that outside the limits of Christianity there can be absolutely no true religion and no soul-ennobling thoughts. Now, we find in the religions of Egypt, and of India, and of China thoughts which seem to us the very echoes of the Gospel, and yet they were fixed in languages which we are but now beginning to read, centuries before the Christian era. We find in the crude worship of Africans and South Sea Islanders yearnings after the Eternal and thoughts about Him which are closely akin to our own. We are brought, moreover, face to face with such facts as that in this nineteenth Christian century the number of nominal Christians in the world does not exceed 360 millions, while the number of nominal Buddhists alone is some 500 millions; or that Christian England is at this moment by far the greatest Muhammadan Power in the world, and that 41 millions of British subjects are followers of Islam. If an average English Christian, such as we are thinking of, will sit down calmly before a map of the world coloured so as to show the different races and religions, he will realise truths which he will not find it easy to reconcile with his older faith and with the justice and mercy of God.

These facts will come before us more and more. Representatives of these nationalities and these religions meet us in our streets, speak to us from our platforms and through the press, and they ask what message Christianity has for them. That question we cannot, we dare not, avoid.

On the other hand, there are many among us, though not of us, who would place the teaching of Christ side by side with that of Confucius or of Buddha, or of Zoroaster, giving it, indeed, a higher place, but making the difference one of degree and not of kind. We feel to a man that Christianity can never, never take that place. To grant it is to grant too much or too little. This reverence is the involuntary homage which error pays to truth, but truth dare not accept it. Christianity is true or false. If false, it has no right to the place they assign to it. If true, its very essence is in the claim to be *the* revelation of God to man in the person of Jesus Christ, and its charter is in the all-embracing words of its Founder—"Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." If Christianity be true it must be, as it has ever been, a missionary religion, aiming to be nothing less than, and destined to be nothing less than, the universal religion of mankind.

The words which I have already spoken have taken more of your time than I had foreseen. In the minutes that are left to me let me dwell upon some of our own weak points, where doubts and difficulties are chiefly lodged, and which form, therefore, the real strength of our foes.

The chief of these is the old truth, which we need to take afresh to heart—that our whole conception of a revelation is too often that of the written Word alone, and that we are content with that written Word without ever grasping the power of its inner meaning. Now revelation is, as the very word implies, a drawing back of a veil. What veil? Not one which covers the Divine Being, but one which rests upon the heart of man. And the man whose inner being has not been brought face to face with the Divine Being has yet to learn what the very essence of Revelation is. Apply this simple test, and ask how far the England of an open Bible and free Christianity has ever received a revelation from God. It is, to put the same truth in another form, if I lay stress upon the fact that the great source of our danger is the wholly inadequate teaching of the young in the simplest elements of religious truth. A knowledge of the outer form in which the revelation is contained they have; of the great truths of the revelation itself they are for the most part wholly ignorant. If I were to examine an ordinary middle-class school—and the same remark applies with equal force to schools of lower grade, and with, it may be, greater force to schools of a higher grade—the boys would be able to tell me all the names of the kings of Israel and Judah, and would perhaps say them backwards as well as forwards, but there would be scarcely an answer if I asked them of the revelation of God to David, by which he passed from sin to holiness. They could all, perhaps, draw for me a map of St. Paul's missionary journeys without a mistake; but there would hardly be a reply if I asked them of the wondrous truths which he preached wherever he went, and which

were a revelation to the heathen world. If I were to examine an ordinary class in a theological college I should find that they knew the last views of the last commentator much better than they knew the text of the Bible itself, and that they knew the text much better than the spiritual truth contained in it. If I were to examine the books on an ordinary drawing-room table, I should find the last quarterlies and the last monthlies, with a criticism, perhaps, on the Fourth Gospel, or the method of Butler's *Analogy*, and I should find young women and young men reading and discussing these who had never understood either St. John or the *Analogy*, and could not, therefore, possibly judge whether their critics had. All this is not to be wondered at when the nursemaid and the tutor and the schoolmaster are employed to do what from their very position the natural or spiritual parents alone can do—to train the child whom God has given them, and whom God will require at their hands. If children grow up with a mere form which is called religion, or with a caricature of religion, worse than even a mere negation, it is no matter for wonder that in the crises of their lives this form or caricature gives way, and they become the bitterest foes of that in which they trusted and found it did not sustain them. The remedy is in the hands of the mothers and fathers of England, in the hands of every woman or man to whom God has given the greatest of all privileges and the greatest of all responsibilities—that of moulding the character of a child. They cannot indeed feed a child with spiritual meat, but they can watch and pray that the milk be pure and free from the poison of deceit. They can teach in their power and not in form the simple truths of the Gospel, which the very relation of child and parent will make clear, and these truths will prove an invulnerable armour for the child they love in the after battle of life. That youth will need no dark cloud of Agnosticism to deliver him from all thought of God who has been really taught that in Jesus Christ God is his Father, loving and caring for and forgiving him, and that if he sins Jesus Christ is the propitiation for his sins, and is an advocate with the Father. That man will feel no difficulty in the wider spread of some gleams of light who has been taught that there is a Light which lighteth every man, and that the Great Shepherd has sheep in other folds whom He is ever leading, that there may be one Shepherd and one flock. He will rather regard every ray of the many-coloured lights which meet him in nature, in history, in the religions of the world as parts of the great whole, which are to be combined in the pure light of the Eternal Day. He will claim all light and all life, and all love as Christian, because Christ is the Light and the Life of the world, and love is the nature of God. He will believe that men who in their gloom have but the light of a star and follow that light, will be guided until it stand over the place where the child lies, and they bow in homage before the Incarnate Son of God revealing God to man.

Another of our weak points is that our teaching is too negative. We allow the enemy to fight upon our ground; we ought rather to fight upon his. It is a dangerous sign when the apologetic literature of a country is stronger than its dogmatic, and when a large proportion of the sermons we hear have for their chief aim to prove the truth of

Christianity or meet the objection of the last German critic, which the preacher knows perchance only by hearsay. Our commission is to preach the Gospel; we may safely leave the results in God's hands. The strength of our position is in the power of Christianity over the minds of men and the reformation of the world by its means. When did apostle preach or write without setting forth the death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ? We may count on our fingers the great successful religious teachers of our own day. They are not the men who deal most with the "modern doubts and difficulties in relation to revealed religion," but they are those who deal most with the grand old certainties and blessings which it has brought to man.

Another, and the last of our weak points which I shall dwell upon, and that but for a moment, is the small degree in which we prove to the world by singleness of purpose and devotion of life that we have ourselves received, and therefore can declare to others, a revelation from God. It is now more than twelve years ago since Keshub Chunder Sen, while lecturing in Calcutta, used these words—"I regard every European settler in India as a missionary of Christ, and I have a right to demand that he should always remember and act up to his high responsibilities. But alas! owing to the reckless conduct of a number of pseudo-Christians, Christianity has failed to produce any wholesome moral influence on my countrymen." That remark was cheered to the echo; and the world will always feel that it has a right to make a like demand of us, and a right to exaggerate our failures. If we could, clergy and laity, speaker and hearer alike, go forth from this Church Congress filled with the true spirit of Christianity, living it and in our lives declaring it, we should carry with us the most powerful evidence of a revealed religion—evidence before which all doubts and difficulties have vanished in the past, do vanish in the present, and will vanish to the end of time.

REV. PROFESSOR STANLEY LEATHES, D.D.

MUCH as the ground may shift that becomes from time to time the scene of the conflict between believers and unbelievers in revealed religion, it is probable that doubts and difficulties about revelation will always be capable of being classed under one or other of two main and general heads—those, namely, which arise from the contemplation of the phenomena of nature, and those which arise from the contemplation of man in his moral and spiritual constitution. In one or other of these regions doubt arises from time to time and calls in question the facts or statements advanced by revelation. For, distinct as the difficulties connected with history and biblical criticism may at first sight appear, they virtually belong to the second head, as bearing upon man and his actual constitution. They are a subdivision rather than a separate branch; or, at least, it may be convenient so to regard them. It is certain, moreover, that, as the sphere of our contemplation under these several heads is continually enlarging, so our position, with respect to the difficulties arising

from them, must continually require re-adjustment. It is impossible to devise any method by which they may be once and for all disposed of. The relation between fact and doubt, statement and denial, is a permanent relation, and can only cease to be so upon one or other of the factors ceasing to exist; upon which the essential features of our condition would be changed, and we should cease to be what we are—beings striving after truth and light through opposite and conflicting circumstances. Assuming, then, or admitting that the facts of nature and of human nature are what they are, supposing that there were no difference of opinion as to these various facts—that all persons, whether believers or unbelievers, were agreed about them, which, of course, is not the case—it must be borne in mind that the idea of revelation is, after all, only a theory purporting to account for the problems these facts present. It is conceivable that a believer and an unbeliever might be virtually at one with regard to certain facts of nature and of human nature; and yet the believer might thankfully accept the theory of revelation, as affording the best solution or explanation of those facts, while the unbeliever might as scornfully reject it as wholly inadequate to account for them. If this is admitted as in any way conceivable, it will serve to show that the difference between believers and unbelievers may, after all, not be one of facts, but rather of the interpretation of facts. When once, however, this is duly recognised, there must surely be an end to much of the acrimony that too often prevails between believers and unbelievers. I do not, by any means, say that this is an exhaustive statement of the relation between those who do and do not believe, but it is a statement that might conceivably be true, and, so far as it was, it would put the relation between the two parties in a new and apparently a more advantageous light.

For example, the facts and phenomena of nature are the same to all of us so far as we correctly apprehend them; they are those positive and objective facts which many persons can alone study with satisfaction. It is, however, hopeless to suppose that we can ever exhaust these facts. We shall continually advance in the knowledge of them. It is equally hopeless to imagine that we shall ever in our present state arrive at absolute knowledge either of our relation to the eternal world, or of its relation to a Higher Being or order of beings. Until then such absolute knowledge is attained, it is clear that any knowledge of the facts of nature may co-exist with belief in the person of an Ultimate Being, as the Creator or Cause of all things, and that belief in His Person may, to those who embrace it, offer the best provisional solution of the facts they recognise. Even they themselves do not insist upon the solution as complete and absolute; but it nevertheless is to them a sufficient provisional solution, and if taken from them leaves the whole problem utterly unsolved. If others declare that it offers no solution to them, that cannot destroy its value where it is recognised, seeing that they have no other solution to offer in its stead. So long, then, as the facts themselves are not tampered with or garbled, it is conceivable that the evidence they furnish of the existence of a Supreme Being may vary in its degree of cogency with the mind that contemplates them.

To some that evidence may seem to be almost conclusive ; to others it may appear to have no strength at all. This will depend not upon the facts themselves, but upon the interpretation of the facts ; not upon the amount of evidence, but upon the ability of the individual mind to accept and appreciate the evidence. But there is no reason to doubt that this will vary in various cases ; and as long as it does do so, there must be those who believe and those who believe not ; those to whom the theory of revelation supplies an enormous want, and those who have no sense of the want which it is intended to supply and professes to supply. It becomes therefore a very serious question how far these latter persons are warranted in treating the convictions of others with contempt, so long as the facts under contemplation are not modified but only interpreted by their convictions or by the theory which they hold.

Nor is it otherwise with the facts of history. We may perhaps be allowed to hope that the day is past when the personal history of Jesus Christ could be seriously regarded as a myth ; and the believer may point with confidence to the long series of acknowledged facts connected with the appearance of Jesus Christ, the ostensible preparation for His coming, and the obvious effects of it upon the world, as presenting a consistent historical problem that is sufficiently explained upon the theory of Divine Revelation, but not upon any other, though the force with which even that body of evidence may appeal to particular minds will vary with the particular mental constitution of each mind ; we may, however, fairly say, that the facts being what they are, and not liable to intrinsic or essential modification, the weight which they will have must depend rather upon the attention and care bestowed upon them, than upon the nature of the facts themselves, which is not open to serious question. At all events it is important to observe that the doubts and difficulties of our day in relation to revealed religion, have quite as much to do with the acceptance of the theory of revelation as a sufficient solution of the problems of fact, as they have with any expansion or modification in our knowledge of facts. The truth is, the theory of revelation addresses itself to a particular want, for which it provides the only known or discoverable supply. The application of the theory will vary as our knowledge varies ; but as there is nothing in the knowledge itself to supply the want, the relation between the want and its supply, which is a permanent one, will depend not upon the increase of the knowledge, but upon the felt intensity of the want. Where the severity of the problem presses with crushing weight, the relief afforded by the remedial theory will be gladly welcomed ; but where this experience is not shared, there will be no desire to accept the theory, not because it is contradicted by facts, but because the oppressiveness of the facts without it is not felt as a burden on the consciousness.

There is one consideration which is often lost sight of in dealing with the evidence for revealed religion, which is, that it is very much of the same *kind* as the evidence for Providence. Every Christian man recognises the operation of Providence in the daily concerns of his own life. It is simply impossible as a matter of evidence to

establish the reality of this operation. The believer requires no further proof of it. The unbeliever admits of none, not because Providence does not operate in his own life, but because he refuses to acknowledge that it does. To the believer the theory of Providence comes with the relief of Salvation; to the unbeliever it is a mere delusion rejected with disdain, not merely because it brings no relief, but because no relief is wanted; not merely because facts contradict the theory of Providence, but because the relation of the theory to the facts is not perceived. Now it can not be denied that there is much in the theory of revealed religion, as it has come to us, which is of the same nature as that which we discern in Providence, whatever else there may be; it is absurd, therefore, to suppose that those who disbelieve in Providence will be ready to believe in a revelation through a series of Providential acts; whereas, unquestionably, a real belief in revelation, that is, an acceptance by the mind of the *theory* of revelation would dispose the judgment for the recognition of Providence in daily life; and it may even be that, as looking up into vast regions of cloudless colourless air produces the effect of blue sky, which may well serve for the dwelling place of God, if there be a God to dwell there, though to the philosopher it may be nothing more than vast regions of colourless air—so, looking upon an accumulation of what we now recognise as Providential acts in daily life, may produce the effect which we perceive in revelation as a whole, and accept as the evidence of the expression of the Divine will, though the philosopher may be proof against the one and may deny the other. It is more important to recognise the expression of that will than it is to dwell upon the *mode* of its expression. The question is, whether there is any distinct voice of God to which we can appeal, rather than whether this or that is the voice of chief authority. If God has distinctly spoken, then He must have resorted to means which make His voice distinctly audible, and it must be a matter for our discrimination and judgment to determine what they are. There are two apparently opposite theories in the present day which are equally destructive of any real utterance of the Divine will. The one is, that God has not spoken at all, and that what we regard as His voice is the mere delusion of our own minds, the invention of our own imaginations; the other is, that God's voice is to be heard in all religions, but in no one religion to a paramount degree—that some few religions are pre-eminent, and that it rests with ourselves to cull from them all that which is most Divine, not that which God has indeed spoken, but that which in our judgment it would be most worthy of Him to utter were He actually to speak. The latter theory is undoubtedly the more plausible, the more popular, and therefore the more dangerous in the present state of thought. But let it be observed that it is absolutely fatal to the theory of revealed religion in any true sense of the words. If God spoke by Jesus Christ He did not speak tentatively, or empirically, or provisionally, but with supreme and ultimate authority. "Lord, to whom shall we go, Thou hast the words of eternal life?" "The words that I speak unto you they are spirit and they are life." If, therefore, Christianity is true, it is true not because it is one of the principal

religions of the world and the best of them, but because it is the religion which has received Divine sanction in a way that no other can pretend to have received it. To deny this, is to deny the very claims that Christianity makes on its own behalf, whether in the person of Jesus Christ or of His Apostles. If their authority is to be rejected, by all means let us reject it; but let us not accept it nominally, and yet deny that it is intrinsically and generically different from any other that can be compared with it. For that is to shut our eyes to facts of history and literature which are unique, and have no true counterpart elsewhere.

It would be out of place now to attempt to establish this position. The more appropriate question to decide is, whether there is any indication in the nature of things that such a theory of revealed religion is even probably to be retained. Such an indication may, perhaps, be sought for in vain in the physical universe. At all events, the *moral* constitution of man would be found a more cognate, and therefore a more promising, sphere of inquiry. And here it is undeniable that we may find strong reason for anticipating a definite revelation, or at least for recognising such a one as consistent with the nature of man, and specially adapted to it, and therefore probably to be received. All investigation into our moral constitution discovers the existence and recognition of a voice which asserts itself as supreme. This voice is the counterpart of our personal being. It addresses itself to us as persons. It is not sufficiently represented when we say, *I* must not do this or that; it is only adequately expressed in its irresistible majesty when we hear it saying, *thou* shalt not do this or that. In other words, we are conscious of a moral barrier that we cannot pass—of a something that controls us morally. If this something is moral, it must be expressive of will, because it appeals to our will, our reason, our judgment, our conscience, and cannot be resolved into matter or circumstance. It cannot then conceivably be inanimate, unconscious, less endowed with personal characteristics than we are ourselves. It must surely, that is, be personal: if otherwise, how does it appeal to us in the very foundation of our personal existence? It deals with us as its servants and vassals, and we feel that we are right in acknowledging its sway. It must, therefore, be superior to us; and it is absolute, because it does not change as we change, but asserts a permanent and standard will, which is the same to others that it is to ourselves. Here, then, is the evidence, the undeniable evidence, of a moral law revealed in our nature which, as it is uniform, must express a uniform will continually asserting itself, making us aware of its existence—its presence. But if this law, this will, indicative of a person, is thus continually, uniformly, and universally speaking—for all, everywhere, and at all times have recognised the *Thou shalt not*; and if at some times the voice makes itself more audible than at others, there is nothing inconsistent with the nature of things in its saying not only “*Thou shalt not*,” but “*Thou shalt not, for I am the Lord thy God.*” In fact, the one revelation is correlative of the other. There is no authority that can say universally “*Thou shalt not*” but *His* who can say “*I am the Lord thy God.*” But the revelation that actually

says "I am the Lord thy God" is an actual revelation—a revelation that actually speaks, and the evidence of which is the thing spoken. That we bow before the law as soon as it is proclaimed is the evidence of its authority. Our own reason is the voucher for its authority being Divine, for no lesser authority should we deign to recognise. But the step is a natural, an obvious, and may we not say, a necessary one, when we consider the requirements of our own well-being and the honour and glory of God, between the authoritative proclamation of the will and the declaration of the authority on which the will is based—the manifestation of the authority whose the will is. But this is revelation—this is the essence and the foundation of revealed religion. We cannot actually know anything of God unless God has in some form or other actually spoken for the purpose of revealing Himself. If He has said, "I am the Lord thy God," He has done so. He cannot have done so without revealing Himself, or without doing it in order to reveal Himself. And in whatever way this is done, whether by the utterance of law, or by the Providential development of recorded history, or by the life, teaching, and death of an individual man, the result is the revelation of a will, and therefore the manifestation of a person. Many things may combine to produce this manifestation, but it cannot be produced without a revelation to the conscience, and this revelation to the conscience is its own justification to the conscience; that is, the proof of revelation is in the thing revealed, the person manifested; and when that thing is the will of God, and that person the person of God, we have the highest evidence we can have of the reality of the revelation, even as light is its own evidence to the eye that beholds it. In His light we see light. That some persons or that we ourselves have no organs by which we can perceive this light, is no evidence that other persons do not see it, but rather a convincing proof that there may be facts in nature, and in human nature, which demand recognition, and have a message of their own, though they cannot be recognised or their message received except upon conditions favourable for their recognition and reception. Where these conditions are unfulfilled, there can be nothing but difficulty and doubt, insuperable difficulty and persistent doubt. Where they are fulfilled, there is but one word that can express the result, and that word is *revelation*. The theory is seen to be so complete, that it appeals to the reason and the conscience with the force and majesty of truth. The vast fields of colourless impalpable ether assume the apparent consistency of deep blue sky, and the burnished firmament becomes the magnificent dome of an eternal palace, which is the dwelling place of God. The mists and clouds of difficulty and doubt are rolled away, and we look straight up into the clear vault of the Father's home. This may be so, despite the things which we know, and the things which we know not, despite the "palpable obscure" of circumambient mystery that envelopes the origin and nature of this material universe, despite the hopeless uncertainty, the unintelligible wonder, that is connected with our own history and origin, despite the innumerable unsolved and insoluble questions concerning the rise, preservation, and significance

of the sacred records of the Jewish and the Christian Churches, despite a variety of intelligent and unintelligent problems that men delight in proposing for the sake of proposing them ; but whether we are wise, or whether we are unwise, the reception of the voice of God by the obedient conscience as God's voice will always issue in the same result, which is the acknowledgment of a Divine revelation, and the conviction that it is not we who have invented or discovered this revelation, but that it is God who has revealed it unto us. The appearance of the revelation may be like that of the blue sky, partly an appearance, though at least resolvable into the elements of fact, but behind the revelation is the God who has revealed Himself.

REV. ROBINSON THORNTON, D.D.

THE word "Modern" has been most wisely prefixed to the subject proposed—"Doubts and Difficulties in Relation to Revealed Religion." The defenders of Christianity have too long been reproached with being behind the time, with not having kept pace with the spirit of the age, with meeting the advocates of free-thought with antiquated arguments calculated only for the less enlightened and more timid free-thought of a past century. The reproach is unfair, and to a great extent unmerited : still we cannot but confess that there is some little ground for it. More than one text-book of Christian evidences in general use is inadequate to the wants of the present day. New phases of doubt have arisen, new forms of difficulty have been found, or invented ; and the reasoning which held good against Tindal and Collins, Woolston and Chubb, Toland and Paine, fails to meet the new requirements of these later days. Take the most universally known manual of Christian evidence, I mean Paley's, and try to find in it a reply to the arguments you will hear advanced by a lecturer against revealed religion,—and, I may add, to some of the really honest doubts which perplex the minds of not a few thoughtful people at the present time, people who believe, and wish to believe, and doubt in no spirit of nonchalant scepticism,—and your search will be almost in vain. Nay, even Butler's great and invaluable work does not give us all we need. The text he takes from Origen, that "he who considers the Scriptures to have proceeded from the Author of nature must needs expect to find in them just such difficulties as he finds in nature," is unanswerable as against a Theist, but does not meet the case of one whose doubt is whether there be an Author of nature at all. Very properly, then, does Christlieb remind his readers, at the outset of his valuable lectures, that "in the last age the issue lay between Biblical Christianity and Deism ; now it lies between Christianity and—nothing." The matter is being taken up by the Christian Evidence Society. It is their object to organise an opposition to the "nothing," and to enable Christians to grapple successfully with modern as well as past forms of unbelief ; and this they endeavour to do by procuring and urging the systematic study of such modern works as exhibit most clearly the

method to be adopted in dealing with the actual practical questions of the day, in preference to such as only touch the views, now become to a large extent merely theoretical, of a century ago.

The chief difficulties of revelation are ordinarily supposed to lie in those Scripture statements which appear irreconcilable with modern discoveries; in short, the so-called scientific difficulty is imagined to be the only one. Here, first, let me protest against this popular restriction of the name Science to natural history and physics. With every desire that the study of the material creation and its laws should be accorded the high place it deserves, with the greatest satisfaction in knowing that it is not now, as once it was, condemned, derided, or proscribed, I must venture to plead that there are other sciences than the physical, other objects of study than material phenomena. I can no more allow one group of sciences to monopolise the name of Science than I can acquiesce in one branch of the Church arrogating to itself alone the name of Catholic. To this protest let me add a second. It is commonly said that "the clergy" are opposed to the study of physical science. I protest against the charge, and, on behalf of my brethren, emphatically deny its truth. There may, of course, be here and there anti-scientists among the clergy, as amongst the laity—have we not all read the Syllabus?—but I am confident that the clergy, as a body, are deeply interested in natural science, and friendly to its pursuit in every form. They wish it to be carefully studied, and investigations to be pushed to the furthest possible extent. They know that between Scripture rightly interpreted and the facts of science rightly understood there can be no antagonism; their cause has nothing to fear, but everything to gain, from an extended acquaintance with facts. They object only to accept hypotheses as facts, and decline to surrender their cherished beliefs and hopes at the bidding of the fabricator of a crude theory, or the possessor of an imperfect induction.

This scientific difficulty is, I imagine, as far as we stand at present, rather over-estimated. It may have been, and probably has often been, put forward to establish a foregone conclusion; and very likely, when the first wave of extended discovery burst upon us, and found many of us rather blindly attached to, than profoundly acquainted with, our Bible, the faith of some may have been rudely shaken. But I do not believe that physical science has been found to give so full a solution to all the problems of existence as to engender disbelief, or even doubt of Revelation in the mind of any candid students, or to satisfy the doubter's need. I cannot believe that the man of science, as such, is more likely than the unscientific to surrender his faith.

There is a society which has done, and is doing, good work in this direction, the Victoria Institute. Its design is to examine scientifically those scientific conclusions which are alleged to be incompatible with the truth of Scripture and the belief of Christians, and to show where either the conclusions are unsound, or the contradictions imaginary. This is surely a wise course to pursue; it is only fair that we should, in our turn, closely look into that science which itself exhorts us to doubt.

I can but just allude to the mathematical form of scientific doubt, which requires pure demonstrative evidence before belief can be accorded ; as if Faith could rest upon a syllogism. The reply to this difficulty in brief will be to say that the provinces of the exact sciences and of the higher truths, the region of knowledge and that of faith, are so different, that to require for one the same evidence as for the other would be like applying the infinitesimal calculus to the arithmetic of constant quantities.

Passing over, then, the Scientific, we come to the Historical. But the difficulty of modern times is not concerned with the Scripture history, for it is prior to all Scripture and to all history. The doubt of the most modern times does not circle round the written Revelation. Both difficulty and doubt come in at a far earlier metaphysical point. It is on the existence of a personal Supreme Being that issue is joined. We are not invited, as we were a century or half a century ago, to choose between the God of the Bible and the God of Nature,—in fact, between Baal and Jehovah ;—it is the very existence of God that is in dispute, or, rather, that is clearly set down to be unprovable, untrue, impossible. Given a God, it is admitted, a revelation of Himself is possible, and, indeed, probable ; and the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures would have a *locus standi* in their claim to contain that revelation : but a revelation is *a priori* impossible when there is no one to reveal.

The main argument—and it is a powerful one, we must allow—alleged against the Deity of Revelation is to this effect. “ You tell us,” it is urged, “ that God is infinite in benevolence, justice, purity, wisdom, power. Can He be infinitely benevolent, and yet permit the existence of so much evil and suffering as we see in his creation? We are averse to believe in a benevolent Deity who permits even the very meanest of his creatures to suffer for a second, when He could have prevented that suffering ; or in an all-just God who allows the smallest injustice to be done even by the greatest of His creatures to the lowest, when He could prevent that injustice ; or in an all-pure God who can connive at deeds impure, by letting them be done when He might prevent their perpetration ; or in an all-wise God who so orders His creation as to acquiesce in that continual waste of power, and failure in the accomplishment of His supposed design, which we see around us. Either His benevolence, justice, purity, wisdom, or else His power, must be limited : on either hypothesis the Creator set forth in your alleged revelation is a limited and conditioned Being, and, therefore, not a God.”

This difficulty, the co-existence of evil with God, though brought most prominently forward at the present time, is really not a new one. It will be familiar to those who have read Robinson Crusoe ; they will all remember how Defoe makes Friday put the perplexing question, “ Why does not God kill the devil ? ”

The answer to the objection, I presume, must take something of this form. We allow the existence of evil, for who can gainsay it ? but its existence does not necessarily prove a limitation of power or of benevolence on the part of the Creator. It has to be shown first that the annihilation of evil is possible in itself ; and it is no

irreverence to say that Divine Power cannot extend to that which is in itself impossible. "*Convenientius dicitur*," says Aquinas, "*quod ea non possunt fieri, quam quod Deus ea non possit facere*." In the stricter classical Latinity we may say *Deus nequit*; whereas *Deus non potest* would be blasphemy. Now, for aught we know, evil may be a necessarily existent correlative of good; and, if so, the objection disappears. "*Deus dicitur omnipotens quod potest omnia possibilis absolute*;" if the entire absence of evil from the side of good is not *possibile absolute*, omnipotence is not limited by its presence. God, though all-powerful, "cannot deny Himself;" perhaps the entire destruction of evil is no more possible than Divine self-negation.

We shall be told that this may possibly be true of *moral* evil, but that the particular form of *physical* evil, which we call suffering, cannot be necessary, and, therefore, must be permitted by the Creator; and that this permission must be given either because He cannot, or because He will not, withhold it. In the latter case benevolence, in the former power, would be lacking. Without going into the question whether physical evil may not be as necessary a correlative of physical good as moral evil of moral good, we may reply that it is not necessarily true that suffering is *in itself* a physical evil. Relatively to us it may be so, and, indeed, is so; relatively to God, it is a means of perfecting His creation; and if so, since immediate and entire perfection is impossible (because, if all became at once absolutely perfect, the creature would be put on a par with the Creator), each step towards that perfection must be in itself good and not evil. I have been speaking of human suffering. The suffering of the lower creation, we must feel, has been greatly exaggerated. We are not certain that nine-tenths of what we call suffering in them is really suffering at all. (As a strong supporter of the prevention of cruelty to animals, I may as well remark that I admit the other tenth, and am ready to use every means to prevent its deliberate infliction by the hand of man.) It may be poetically beautiful to say—

"The poor beetle that we tread upon
In corporal sufferance feels a pang as great
As when a giant dies,"

but it is absurdly untrue: and the residuum of real suffering is just as much a discipline of the creature as in the case of humanity.

There remains, then, another physical evil, the evil of unproductiveness and waste. Infertile seeds, seeds fertile but never allowed to grow, undeveloped germs, possibilities never developed into actualities, these are all supposed to show a lack of intelligence and of perfect contrivance on the part of the Author of all. Surely, however, doubt of His Being on this ground is most unfair, unless we can claim to be perfectly aware of the object which, in the Supreme Counsel, each germ was intended to attain, and are able to show that it has failed to attain it. We are not justified in assuming an object, however probable, and then asserting that it has not been reached. We are not at liberty to assume, for instance, that all seeds were intended to germinate; if they were not, then their non-germination is not a failure, but a fulfilment of the Creator's purpose.

Such an answer, I conceive, may be returned to the arguments which throw doubt on the existence of a personal Creator from supposed moral and intellectual deficiencies. We may go on to suggest some causes that may have been at work to predispose men in the direction of doubt. If we can deal with them, we are cutting off the evil at the root.

First, the habit of using continually the abstract scientific terms "law" and "force" is apt to lead men to forget the Lawgiver and Supreme Agent. Of that well-known and deeply interesting work, "*The Reign of Law*," I venture to like the title least. It includes a misleading personification; for it is not the law that reigns, but the Ruler who wills to reign according to law. "They continue this day according to Thine ordinance, for all things serve Thee,"—not "serve the ordinance." And so when we continually talk of "force" producing such and such phenomena, we are in danger of coming unwittingly to think of this force as a Baal, a something which has in itself the faculty of originating and controlling motion, irrespective of a Supreme Wielder. I am not so presumptuous as to propose any plan for altering such expressions, nor do I say that they should be, or even can be, altered: I merely point to them as means whereby a habit of mind is produced, in which men are not unlikely to have their recognition of a personal Deity, as revealed in the Scriptures, weakened, if not brought to an end. We can only do our best to unite inseparably with law the notion of a Lawgiver, and with evolution that of an Evolver, and the perilous phrases are shorn of their danger.

Secondly, I fear that many doubts have arisen from a false conception of the character of the Deity. The argument I have already spoken of is, in fact, based upon a mistaken idea of the perfect justice, the unchangeableness, and the irresistible power of God. Now, the popular religious school of the last three centuries has always been fatalist. No doubt there was every reason why the reaction from the gross Pelagianism taught before the Reformation should land men in the doctrines we know as Calvinistic. From works of supererogation, and grace of condignity, man seemed to rush for refuge to the Divine decrees, the total corruption of humanity, and the arbitrary bestowal of irresistible grace. But the popular—shall I say vulgar?—form of Predestinarian doctrine, was, and is, not that of Aquinas, or Bradwardine, or our own Article: it simply represents the Creator as purposely creating millions of beings with the deliberate intent to plunge them, without the possibility of escape, into eternal and hopeless torment, and as designing it to be part of the joy of a chosen few to listen to their unavailing utterances of agony. No wonder that men have come to doubt the benevolence, and so the being, of One thus portrayed to them. The God-doubting scepticism of modern days, strange to say, draws at least a fibre or two of its spreading roots from the Augustinian theosophy.

Once more. There is a third reason for doubt, and for the eager seizing upon difficulties, which is not connected with the use of language, nor yet with the popular misconception of a somewhat one-

sided and daring theology. It is to be found in the human mind itself, and its conditions among us at the present time. In times past, as we all well know, the spirit abroad was that of superstition, —whatever amount of unbelief we may imagine to have been underlying it, as unbelief does commonly underlie superstition. By superstition, we mean the tendency to refer every strange and new phenomenon to the direct intervention of a higher power, to look upon that power with terror and dread, and to resort to imaginary means of warding off its probable attacks; "*superstitio*," says Cicero, "*in qua tristis timor inanis decorum*." We are now fast reaching the very converse of this condition, the contradictory of superstition. There is a growing dislike to recognise the supernatural—I mean what is called the "supernatural," for the term is a misleading one: it would be more correct to say the "superhuman," since we want to express, not 'that which seems at variance with the common order of nature,' but, 'that which is above man's ability and comprehension.' Instead of seeing a Higher Power everywhere, the tendency now is to refuse to see anywhere anything but a blind resistless fate, or a force conceivably, if not actually, within the control of men: instead of putting faith in superstitious observances, men are running to the other extreme, and declining to pray. The superhuman is to be eliminated. "*Nous suffons Dieu*," "we strike God out of the account," is the polite and elegant phrase quoted by the Bishop of Orleans, in which this tendency finds its ultimate expression. The pride of humanity in itself, alas! is growing under the influence of those very gifts of knowledge which ought to make it more conscious of its own shortcomings. So it was that in past ages Angels fell.

What can we do, we who wish ourselves and others under our guidance to steer clear at once of unenlightened credulity and presumptuous unbelief?

I need hardly say that the Bible must be more narrowly and deeply studied than ever. But we must also urge, as I have already hinted, the exact and careful study of natural science. There is no greater safeguard to the truth than the study of truth. Whatever may be the pernicious effects of a smattering of science, or of the pursuit of one branch as if it were the whole, is it not the fact that the wider and deeper a man's acquaintance with the great Book of Nature, the more sure he is to find the superhuman there, and be compelled to acknowledge it?

It is scarcely necessary to say that in dealing with the doubter, we must do so in a spirit of confidence and love, giving him credit for a sincerity which is present in three cases out of four,—for most doubt is, in the main, honest doubt,—and striving to win over rather than to terrify. But perhaps I may be allowed to add that to deal tenderly with the doubter does not involve tenderness to his doubt. Charity is of persons, not of propositions. Some have imagined that the doubter may be conciliated by representing the points at issue as being of less vital consequence than they really are. For instance, they will say that a revolution, after all, is concerned with morality rather than with a set of doctrines, with action rather than belief,

and that the Sermon on the Mount is of far greater importance than the first chapter of St. John's Gospel: whereas revelation is of a religion, that is of certain relations between God and man; and the morality is founded on them, not they on the morality. Such concessions lead to no useful results. The partly converted doubter soon finds himself confronted with his original difficulty. It is at once most prudent and most loving to adhere unswervingly to the full yet simple truth, "for us there is one God the Father, of Whom are all things, and we in Him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by Whom are all things, and we by Him."

ADDRESSES.

REV. BROWNLOW MAITLAND, London.

It has been often remarked, and I think not without justice, that some at least of the difficulties which candid sceptics feel about Revelation have been aggravated, if not almost entirely occasioned, by the injudicious character of the positions not seldom assumed in its defence. In these days, perhaps more than ever before, bad arguments are worse than useless, and the exaggerations with which a substantially just claim is urged, create a serious prejudice against the claim itself. When, for instance, spiritual truths, which appeal for their only possible verification to the developed spiritual consciousness and experience of mankind, are brought out into the arena of physics or logic, as if they could be proved by scientific inductions or rigorous demonstrations, we ought not to be surprised if those who really know the limits of science and logic turn away with a contemptuous impatience. Or again, when the substantial verity of Revelation is identified with some rigid and rounded theory about the mode, the progress, or the limits of inspiration, into agreement with which many of the facts cannot be brought without manifest distortion, it is unavoidable that offence should be given to those who hold perfect loyalty to fact to be a primary qualification of the seekers after truth. If we would be successful in our endeavours to win the attention of sceptics, to help them over their difficulties, and guide them towards the Divine light, we cannot, I think, be too careful about the quality of our arguments, and the strict limitation of all our statements and inferences by an honest appreciation of facts. I know well that there are strong temptations to take an opposite course. Sweeping assertions, exaggerated pretensions, unbending theories, and a bold persistence in reiterating arguments which have lost their force, are wont to win from the unthinking an approbation which is withheld from honest candour and truthful moderation. But to yield to such temptation is to betray the sacred cause of truth. It affords the keen-witted sceptic just that excuse which he needs for continuing in his unbelief, and it leaves the ill-instructed believer very poorly equipped to resist future assaults on his faith.

There are two difficulties about the acceptance of revealed religion, of which I wish to say a few words in accordance with these remarks. They are both of a very serious kind, and have been strongly pressed on my mind by what experience I have had in this controversy, and they seem to me to owe much of their practical force to errors or deficiencies in the manner in which the truth has often been presented or maintained.

I. The first of these difficulties emerges as soon as we state what we mean by Revelation. We conceive of it as an unveiling to us by God of His character and

will, for our instruction in righteousness and our guidance to eternal life. Such an action on the part of God implies that He is a Being Who knows us, cares for us, desires our well-being and salvation. We cannot conceive of an impersonal cause or force, tendency, or law, acting thus towards us; the idea requires the attributes which we express by personality; it assumes as a necessary antecedent a fatherly God. Now, the first difficulty of the sceptic is this conception of God. Some mysterious unknowable Power behind all phenomena he has little difficulty in acknowledging. But he wants to know what grounds we have for conceiving of this ultimate Power, those of the Gospel of Christ and the kingdom of heaven; and it is by, as in any sense personal, how, supposing that we call this Power God, we can justify our attributing to it that personal quality of Fatherliness which a gracious Revelation presupposes. Till we can answer this demand satisfactorily, it is in vain to urge the claims of Revelation. So that, in attempting to overcome the primary doubt which stands in the way of accepting Revelation, we must begin by arraying the evidence for the existence of a living, personal, Fatherly God.

Well, then, it may be said, we have at this stage only to exhibit the usual theistic argument. But the fact is there are several very different lines of theistic argument which have been and are in common use, and of these some, instead of leading up to the idea of a God, Who can graciously reveal Himself to us, really lead, as it seems to me, in an opposite direction, and, so far as they reach any conclusion at all, land us in a conception of God with which the idea of Revelation is incompatible. And if this be so, such lines of theistic argument must aggravate instead of alleviate the primary difficulty of the sceptic.

Let me ask your indulgence while I try in a few words to explain what I mean.

Roughly speaking, there are three distinct lines of theistic argument, three kinds of reasoned theism.

There is, first, metaphysical theism, founded on reasonings mostly of the *à priori* kind, about the ideas of space, time, causation, the infinite, the unconditioned, the absolute, and so on; the object of which is to shut us up to the conception of some necessary Being or Substance as the ultimate result of thought. Then there is what may be called cosmical theism, which is the final generalisation from the phenomena of the universe, and is reached by ascending from narrower to wider laws, until the induction lands us in some one ultimate law or force, of which the whole cosmos is the development and manifestation. And, lastly, there is spiritual theism, which may be described as an inference from the spiritual consciousness and experience of mankind—an intuition clear in proportion to the spiritual culture of the individual—an assumption or conviction which has for its source and basis the sense of our own intelligent, moral, and spiritual personality.

Now, my point is, that whether we follow the first or the second of these lines of theistic proof, the metaphysical or the cosmical, the utmost we can reach by it is some kind of first principle, necessary in the former case to thought, in the latter to existence. To this first principle the name of God may be given. But, after all, we have not in the least degree got nearer to the conception of a living, loving Father, Who can graciously reveal Himself to us. A personal, spiritual, Fatherly God, freely making an historical revelation of Himself to mankind, is an idea which is not approached by these lines of thought at all, nor is reconcilable with them. The necessary Being of metaphysics is bound by necessity, and cannot be conceived of as a Father. The ultimate cosmical force of physical induction is not person or spirit at all, but purely a physical principle of evolution. If, then, either of these is what we present to the sceptic as God, so far from preparing him to accept Revelation, we lead him away from it, and, in fact, put weapons into his hands to assail it. For he can retort on us that, on our own showing, there is an impassable gulf between the God Whom we pretend to have reasoned out, and the aspect in

which we present to him those historical events which we believe to be God's mode of graciously making Himself known to mankind. But with the remaining kind of theism, which I have called spiritual to distinguish it from the metaphysical and the cosmical, and which is based on the developed spiritual consciousness of our race, it is entirely different. Here we spring at once from the depths of real human experience to the intuition of a living, holy, loving Father, from Whom we may reasonably expect gracious revelations, guidance, and help. And therefore I urge that if we would dispose the sceptic to entertain the idea of Revelation, it is this last line of theistic proof that we ought to follow, and not the others. They aggravate his difficulty by giving him a conception of God from which he cannot pass to the ideas of a Father in heaven, and of an historical manifestation of the Divine will and purpose. In a word, I would say that in this high debate about our right to believe in a Fatherly, self-revealing God, the less we employ *à priori* reasonings and physical inductions the better it will be.

2. The other difficulty of which I wish to speak arises when we place the Bible before the sceptic as the inspired record of God's revelations of Himself; and here, too, I think that serious mischief has arisen from an injudicious and unwarranted manner of exhibiting the idea of Revelation. If we had undertaken to form an *à priori* idea of Revelation for ourselves, very likely we should have expected it to be a communication of pure, unmixed, perfect truth, all on a level throughout, of equal value and authority in every part for all time, and everywhere bearing the full stamp of the heavenly and divine. That there should be in it progress and degrees, or that it should contain much that was lowered and accommodated and transient, and to be superseded by later and more advanced teaching, might perhaps have never occurred to us as probable. Knowing that God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all, we should have been likely to think that His Word coming to men must be like a pure, unmixed, celestial light, shining clear and direct out of heaven on their darkness, undimmed by their atmosphere, unqualified by their perceptive faculties. And, having formed this conception of what Revelation must be, it would be easy and natural to go on to persuade ourselves that the Bible, as its inspired and authoritative record, must have the same character, and be throughout a storehouse of perfect, unmixed truth, every part being equally divine, equally authoritative for all ages, equally on the highest level of moral and spiritual truth. And thus we might come, under such prepossessions, uncorrected by subsequent investigation, habitually to use language about Revelation and the Biblical record of it which would be very widely at variance with facts.

Now, my point is, that this is what, as it seems to me, has been largely done by many popular defenders of Revelation. And the inevitable effect has been to prejudice the inquiring sceptic against the Divine origin and character of the Bible. Looking into it, as he necessarily does, with a cold, critical eye, he finds that it does not at all answer to the description which such advocates are accustomed to give of Divine Revelation. He sees that it certainly is not all on a level, all of a piece, of the same texture throughout, everywhere absolute and perfect in its teaching. On the contrary, its broadest, plainest feature is gradual development, slow advance, organic growth, rising step by step from lower to higher levels, from less to more perfect exhibitions of morality and spiritual truth. And finding this, he has an easy retort on those who are pressing on him the claims of the Bible; for he can say that if, as they teach, Revelation is simply and absolutely a perfect, full-orbed, unqualified communication of heavenly truth, the Bible, whatever it may be, is certainly not that.

What I would urge, then, is that we should be scrupulously careful to put the idea of Revelation before sceptics in a form which they will not afterwards discover to be at variance with what they are sure to find in the sacred pages. How this

may be done is very strikingly shown in the last and ripest work of the late Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, Canon Mozley. Of that distinguished theologian, who has been called the Butler of this century, no one, I believe, has ever impeached the orthodoxy any more than the great intellectual power. And in his latest book, *Ruling Ideas in Early Ages*, he asserts in the most emphatic language the progressive, conditioned character of Revelation. His whole defence of the Old Testament rests on the position that Revelation must in every age have been accommodated to the state of those to whom it was addressed; that it must always have started from their standpoint, condescended to their ignorance, taken up and built upon their ideas, and thus have incorporated with itself in its earlier stages much that was transient, and needed afterwards to be thrown off and condemned. When confronted by the common objection that much of the morality and religion of the earlier portions of the Bible is imperfect and inconsistent with the later teaching, which attains a far higher level, he does not deny the fact, or attempt to get rid of it by forced and uncandid explanations of the Sacred Text; he frankly acknowledges it, and justifies the Bible by the ultimate result, the final outcome, towards which those earlier teachings were but imperfect yet necessary steps. The real morality and religion of the Bible, he insists, are not those of the Patriarchal, or Mosaic, or even the Prophetic times, but this slowly attained and perfect issue alone, as its matured fruit and ultimate standard, that the Bible ought to be judged.

Now, the conception of Revelation presented in this defence of the Old Testament is clearly very different from the popular view to which I have alluded—the view which identifies the Bible with Revelation, and takes the Sacred Volume to be on the same level throughout, a homogeneous whole, equally perfect and equally authoritative for all time in every part. If, on this latter view, Revelation may be imaged by a celestial light shining direct from heaven with absolutely pure rays on human darkness, on the other view, which maintains its progressive and conditional character, it may be more fitly pictured by a leaven infused into the ignorant and corrupt mass of humanity, and gradually leavening it with truth and purity. It is this latter way of putting the matter which I am anxious to recommend, if we would carry the sceptic along with us. Against the other view the Bible itself furnishes him with invincible arguments. Its broad, patent facts refuse to lend themselves to sustain such a theory. But let the honest sceptic be familiarised with the idea of the Divine Spirit informing and guiding mankind from age to age, as they were able to bear it, condescending to their ignorance and superstition, sanctioning for a time a lower morality in order to lead them to a higher, content to use imperfect representations of Divine things so long as more perfect ones were above their capacity, and thus slowly and patiently to guide them through long ages of twilight till the true Sun arose in the fulness of His light and glory; and then the sceptic will come to the Bible prepared for what he will find there, and its mixed character and progressive development will no longer be a stumbling-block to him, or seem to him a contradiction of its claim to be indeed of God.

Rev. J. B. LOWE, D.D.

I do not by any means wish to underrate the gravity of the crisis to which we have arrived. I feel that the issues at stake at the present time are momentous indeed—issues in comparison with which all questions between one Church and another, on any subject on which professing Christians can be divided from one another, sink into insignificance. But while I concede all this, I cannot at the same time sympathise with the alarm with which many earnest-minded people speak of the

mental phenomena of the present time. I do not believe it to be a moral possibility, in this nineteenth century of the Christian era, that materialism and atheism can prevail. The whole moral nature of man—all the higher and better instincts of humanity forbid such a consummation. We can never be persuaded to believe that, mind and body, we are altogether material; that all that has been felt and realised, since man has been able to feel and realise anything at all, about the spiritual and eternal, is an illusion—that heaven and holiness and eternity are all mere sounds; that there is no God to fear, love, serve, and worship; that all the wonderful superstructure of religious and moral truth which has been the great characteristic of human nature, and greater in proportion to the degree of civilization and culture in which man has been found, that all is either a mere imagination or a gigantic lie, and that man has no higher aim in life than to enjoy as much material happiness as possible in this world, and no consolation in death except the prospect of mingling as a gaseous compound of some other member of the vegetable or animal creation. If this were the case, then man, the most important of all the denizens of earth, would be of all “most miserable.”

I stood, a few days ago, on the banks of the Tyne, at Haddington. On the opposite side of the river I looked at the humble cottage which is pointed out as the birth-place of John Knox, the great Scotch reformer. Behind me was the grand Old Abbey Church, one half in ruins, the other consecrated to the pure worship of God and the preaching of the gospel; reminding us at once of the lifeless forms from which the reformation has delivered us, and of the resurrection of evangelical truth which awoke as from the grave of centuries in that memorable age; while in the stream between, some water fowl were disporting themselves in the autumnal sun. As I recalled the toils and dangers which the great reformer had encountered in accomplishing what he supposed to be a work of eternal consequence to men, I could not help thinking that if there were no eternity, if nothing now survived but some gaseous remnant of that once energetic mind, how miserably mistaken was his life! how much happier the lives of the water-fowl that were swimming in thoughtless enjoyment upon the stream!

But if the triumph of atheism be a moral, it is no less an intellectual impossibility. Notwithstanding the assumption of intellectual superiority in which many of our modern sceptics indulge, and the supercilious language which they bring themselves to use concerning all who are sufficiently simple to believe in such antiquated notions as creation, and redemption, and judgment to come, I believe that their exultation is baseless, and that it will soon vanish away before accurate thought and adequate information.

There are two sources of attack upon revelation—criticism and science, and under neither head has anything been advanced which need alarm the believer.

On the subject of criticism, I have only time to say that Christians have never deprecated it, but quite the contrary. It has been as much by the co-operation of believers as by the hostility of others that the fiercest light of modern learning has been turned upon the sacred books. The battle has raged, of late years, with especial activity around the gospels, and it has resulted, I make bold to say, in the triumphant victory of those sacred histories all along the line. If our blessed Saviour had been only the founder of a new philosophy, and the gospels the record of the doctrines of his philosophical scheme, one tithe of the evidence upon which they rest their claims would have been considered sufficient. If the amount of evidence external and internal, direct and indirect, from friends and from foes, which has accumulated in favour of the Christian histories, be not sufficient to establish their claims, the authenticated remains of ancient literature will be scanty indeed. But, what I wish especially to say, is this: if the case were otherwise—if the authorship of

one or more or all the gospel histories were not established, our faith upon the Son of God would not be less certain on that account, for the acknowledged epistles of St. Paul alone would be sufficient to justify our faith in all the fundamental facts and important doctrines of revelation, and the task of accounting for St. Paul himself, as well as for his writings, would be a greater difficulty to the sceptic than any which scepticism could allege against the Christian. It is the resurrection of the Son of God on which our faith is founded. Let that great event be proved, and it is enough for our souls to rest upon; we can contemplate the assaults of scepticism without the least alarm.

To come now to the scientific attack. It has been well said by a previous speaker that truth cannot be inconsistent with truth, and nothing that is really true in science can be inconsistent with revelation. If therefore the supposed discoveries of science appear to be inconsistent with the statements of Scripture, one of two things must be true, either on the one hand, the discoveries, so called, of science must be mistaken, or our interpretation of Scripture requires to be revised. But, as far as I am aware, there has been nothing as yet proved by scientific investigation which need alarm the Christian. Many of the alleged facts on which sceptics rely are mere assumptions, and even if they were proved to be facts, they would not be inconsistent with implicit faith in our Redeemer. Let me give a few illustrations of my meaning. Palæontology, for example, claims to have established a much higher antiquity for the human race than is consistent with the chronology of the Bible, and this has occasioned disquietude to many minds, especially among young believers; but I submit that this uneasiness is not in the least called for—the question has not yet been decided from a scientific point of view. But even suppose it were decided on the side for which scientists contend, would that decision in the least affect our faith? Verily that faith would be worth but little which could be shaken by it. It might indeed oblige us to modify our views of those venerable chapters from which our ideas upon this subject have been hitherto derived; but what I insist upon is this:—that questions of this kind cannot in the least interfere with that implicit faith with which an enlightened Christian rests upon a crucified and risen Saviour.

To take another illustration. Biology has recently been the cause of uneasiness to many minds. The students of that interesting and engrossing science, now teach a material theory of life. Their doctrine is, that life and mind depend on a combination of molecular particles, which they call protoplasm; that thought and will are functions of the brain, dependent, like all other bodily functions, upon nourishment derived from the food which is eaten and the air which is inhaled; and some have gone so far as to infer that there is no spiritual nature in man at all, nor indeed anything spiritual in the universe. Matter, matter, matter! is all that they can see, and in that alone they believe. But granting the correctness of their physiology, I question their inference. Granting that life and thought are the perpetual concomitant of that peculiar substance called protoplasm, is there any scientific impossibility in the supposition which pervades humanity, that there is within us a spiritual nature—a soul which is the ultimate seat of thought, and will and moral feeling? Supposing such a spirit within, may not the brain be the organ by which the subjectivity of that spirit finds shape and form, and comes forth in the region of the material? May not that spirit be endowed with a causal power, by which thought is expressed in the material organ? May not thought, as it exists in the brain, be to thought as it exists in the spirit much in the same relation as, in the Christian scheme, works stand to faith? That as faith is made perfect by works, so the spiritual emotion is made perfect by brain action? Do you say that thought and will are the product of so much food and oxygen as may be consumed in evolving them? I reply, that this concerns the mechanism of the brain

alone; but is it at all inconsistent with the supposition of an unseen hand to which that mechanism is subject? The hand which awakens the tones on a musical instrument does not supply the air in which the chords vibrate, and so put forth their tones; but would not the chords and air alike be silent if there were no living hand to strike the notes?

But, it is argued, if we claim an immortal spirit for man because of his mental and moral characteristics, we must concede the same to the brute creation, because the difference between their minds and ours is one, not of nature, but only of degree. To this I reply that the distinguishing characteristic of the human mind is the apprehension of the metaphysical and eternal; the beast has no knowledge of divine and eternal things, his knowledge is circumscribed altogether by the things which he sees and feels around him. If, then, the mental qualities which we discern in them, such as the fidelity of the dog to his master, or the devotion of the mother bird,—if they seem to indicate a spiritual nature, I have no objection to concede it; but as it only manifests itself in connection with the things of time, we have no right to ascribe to it other than a temporal duration. No argument, therefore, can be derived from the mental endowments of the lower animals against the ascription of a spiritual nature to man. But, it is asked, though there may be no disproof of an immortal spirit in man, derived from biology, what proof can we allege of its existence? I reply, the very discussion in which we are engaged is an answer to the question: for does it not imply the power of apprehending the purely spiritual and eternal? And can we conceive it possible that this power should belong to one whose nature was altogether material? that such an one should have conceived anything at all about supernatural things, or have had any desire for heavenly or spiritual enjoyments?

But in arguing in this way I am really taking low ground. I return to the point on which I have all along insisted—that no discoveries of science can for a moment shake the testimony of revelation. Supposing that there were in human nature itself no evidence of anything higher than the material, the evidence of Scripture would remain unshaken, and that is plain and unmistakable. Biology can find no proof of a future destiny for man; but it can find no disproof of it. Our warrant for believing it is the Word of God. To reject that testimony, because microscopic or chemical research can find no traces of a spiritual nature in man, would not be scientific inference, but dogmatic assertion inconsistent with the name.

I come now to the subject of Evolution, which teaches that the whole vegetable and animal kingdoms are derived from one primordial germ, and that man himself, with all his intellectual and moral nature, is but a development from the same source. Hence it is inferred that our views of creation must be corrected, and many go so far as to say there is no Creator at all. If this be so, of course a lever is put to the very foundation of our faith. But here again the alarm is false, and must give way before accurate thought and more perfect information. The evolution theory is very far from being proved, even with regard to the lower kingdoms of nature. Many minds of the highest order reject it altogether, upon scientific grounds. They have demonstrated that it is weighted with insuperable difficulties in itself, and that it is inconsistent with other well-established doctrines of physical science; that it requires, for example, a length of time for its accomplishment, which, as Sir William Thompson has demonstrated, is disproved by the secular retardation of the earth's motion by tidal action, and also by the dynamical theory of heat in the central luminary of our system; while in reference to man, there is no approach even to a demonstration. The creature, which is alleged to have been our immediate progenitor, is a creature only of philosophical imagination; there are no traces of such a being ever having existed upon earth. But, even supposing the conceits of philosophers should ever become established as facts, my faith in divine revelation

would remain unshaken. As a Christian I should feel unaffected by it. What is called natural religion might be unable to cope with such conclusions, and were we dependent on the light of nature alone, we might be unable to reply to statements against which all our better instincts would nevertheless rebel ; but, as believers in a risen Saviour, we can afford to look with calmness on such discussions ; His resurrection has for ever dispelled all uncertainty about a future state, and supplied our souls with an unchanging resting-place. The restless sea of human doubt and sin shall hurl its billows against this sure foundation, only to be dashed to pieces. They may, indeed, succeed in sweeping away some disfiguring accretions which, in the lapse of ages, may have adhered to it ; and, in doing this, they will render us a valuable service ; but they shall never for a moment shake that everlasting rock on which our peace in life, and consolation in death and hope for eternity shall stand fast for ever. In truth, when one reflects on the place which these great subjects have always held in human estimation, the vast amount of thought accumulated in a thousand libraries, and continually finding expression by human voice and pen, upon matters of a purely metaphysical nature, and then recall the fact that learned men are labouring to prove that their own minds are nothing more than transmuted nitrogen and oxygen, and that, as Mr. Froude expresses it, "one of the greatest natural philosophers of the day is endeavouring to settle the pedigree of the human race, and prove our descent from an African baboon, by studying the courtship of moths and butterflies ;" we cannot but feel that scientific research has reached a bathos of profundity which makes the question "Where is the wise man ?" at least as applicable to our modern philosophers, as it was to their prototypes in antiquity.

DISCUSSION.

Very Rev. Dr. COWIE, Dean of Manchester.

YOUR Grace, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—I should rather have shrunk from coming before you this evening, but that I thought that the writers and speakers would have taken up a very high line, and that perhaps it might be necessary to say a few words on a humbler line. I have heard one paper read and two speeches, which I think fully justified my anticipations ; I think those papers and speeches are worthy contributions to a Church Congress, and I think they will do us credit with the world. I must say that Dr. Thornton's, Mr. Maitland's, and Dr. Lowe's remarks have certainly justified the forecast which I made of having a very high and thoughtful class of papers put before us. Now I should like to say a little in a less ambitious way. I want each one to ask himself, as I ask myself when I am thinking about the doubts and difficulties, how does this modern unbelief originate ? There are not so very many scientific persons—very few indeed—who give themselves over to the real study of these great scientific subjects which bring men into the condition of doubt. But there are a great many readers of magazines and scientific periodicals. To those persons I wish to address a few words of caution. I consider that our present position has been arrived at very much in this way—I put out of sight the high scientific societies of the Metropolis, who meet together and form a sort of class themselves, who would, I think, do well to consider the thoughts put before them this evening—there is a vast number of enquiring young men and young women of all classes who read magazines and other publications which bring before them the results of investigations of the men of science, and who are very much guided by the statements in those periodicals. Now I am for myself confident that I am not quite able to follow them in all their statements. I feel that at the age at which I

have arrived they have rather gone ahead of me. Even when I look at things which are more familiar to me—at mathematics and scientific investigations—I find that I am behind the age; but still I take an interest in endeavouring to find out what the scientific investigators put before me as their conclusions. If this be my case, the case of one whose whole life has been given to science and who owes his position to the pursuits of science, it may be very much the same case with persons who have not had those advantages of leisure I have had for the purpose. I know that amongst my own acquaintances, of middle-aged persons and also of young men, there is a great desire to look into the results of pure science, of chemical science, of geological science, of mental science, and so on. I am using the word “science” in a way which has been contemplated by a previous speaker, and with which I perfectly agree. We are too much inclined to talk about the physical science as embodying the whole of the sciences. That, however, is not a mistake into which persons of any classical education are likely to fall, because the *φυσικά* and the *μετὰ τὰ φυσικά* are distinct branches of science, and they are not likely to think the one embodies the whole. I want to address myself to those who read these results. Some of our scientific men are masters of the language both in speaking and in writing, and they exercise a great influence upon the minds of inquiring people of all ages, and especially upon the young minds. I want to put before them that which I think is reasonable and which I think, at all events all men of business engaged in the affairs of this life, will think reasonable. What is this going to lead to? What is all this doubt about revelation tending to? I tell you what it tends to ultimately—it tends to the abolition of morality altogether. There will be no such thing as morality if these ideas are carried out to their utmost extent; and if you enter upon a study, you are honestly bound to go from stage to stage to the end. You cannot stop. If you take up the thing you ought honestly to follow it out to its conclusion. It leads to the absolute demolition of morality. And I prove it in this way. I take a leading scientific man of the present day, for whom I have a great regard, who is reported to have said that he believes there is no such thing as human will. If you consider what that means, you see it is the destruction of morality. If human will, as he says it is, is only the final outcome of habits derived from our environments, then we become mere machines, and there is no such thing as freedom of action or will. Some of the actions we perform are only mechanical or involuntary, such as inflation of the lungs, and so on. On the new hypothesis, the raising of my arm will come to be reckoned a mere mechanical and involuntary action; and the results of the action of one thing upon another will be the same: there will be no such thing as freedom of action or will. Let every one who is entering upon these investigations consider carefully to what they lead. Next, I want to say a few words on another subject which has been touched upon; and that is, that we are very much governed by the conventional use of terms, such as law and force. Such slavery to words is dangerous and full of pit-falls. What is a law? Does not a law pre-suppose some one to impose it? *Νόμος* comes from *νομίζω*—there must be some source from which the law emanates. It is more difficult to conceive of a law of nature arising of itself than from some one imposing it upon matter. Then again “force.” You are told that all things resolve themselves into molecules and forces. But what is a force? Nobody knows. There is no definition of a force at all, except by its results. The result of force may be either motion or rest. Motion is said to be modified in different ways to produce all the natural energies; that these energies are modifications in some way or other of motion. Well, what is motion? Motion, I say, is essentially an induced state. The induced state is transposition from place to place, if rest is the *natural* condition of matter; the induced state is one of rest, if motion be the

natural condition of matter: but there must be some cause to induce it. Force cannot exist of itself—it cannot rise up out of nothing, except by the Almighty will. Just in the same way as we say law cannot exist without a law giver, so we say there is no such thing as force existing without some cause. And so we come to the final result—there must be a great Almighty intelligent Ruler; and to take the words law and force, and to shelter one's self in them as if they were the ultimate ends at which we arrive, is self deception. I wanted to warn my young friends—those who may be tempted to adopt the *theories* which lead to sceptical views and which some scientific writers too hastily assume to be settled and fixed—to consider, in the first place, well the end before them, to see into what they are going to plunge, and in the next place, not to rest satisfied with words without ascertaining what lies behind them.

REV. JOHN W. BARDSLEY, of St. Saviour's, Liverpool.

YOUR grace, ladies and gentlemen, so far as my experience goes, the class of people is very largely on the increase who desire not only to break down the branches of the Tree of Life, but to tear it up by the roots, and, if possible, to scatter the very soil in which it has been grown. The statement of our subject to-night seems to me, however, rather to deal with the doubts and difficulties which present themselves to the theist—and there is nothing more marvellous than that the theist should disbelieve in the revelation from the God in whom he believes. There seem to be times even in his life when he is tempted to believe in a revelation from on high. This is remarkably shown in the life of Lord Herbert, of Cheshbury, who, when he had written a book against revelation, being in doubt as to whether he should send forth his work to the press, asked that God would give him some intimation whereby he might be decided as to the course he should pursue. Thereon he heard some voice, so he says, such as he had never heard before, and he took this to be an intimation from God that the book was to go forth to the world. That is to say Lord Herbert could believe that God would give him a revelation from heaven with reference to the worth of his book, and yet disbelieve that God would give a revelation from Heaven to save a fallen world. I stand before the Congress feeling my own weakness, but nevertheless anxious to put before you those doubts and difficulties which I find are filling the minds of some of my own parishioners and some of my young friends. I am bold enough to say to-night that some of the doubts and difficulties as regards the sceptic arise from the fact that not only have we believers sometimes making use of weapons that are inefficient, but that we are apt to attempt to defend positions which are not tenable. I believe that nothing can be more disastrous than any efforts of that kind. As a spectacle nothing is grander than to see the gallant defences that some men make. There are questions, however, which are practically settled; and I hold that knowledge on these questions is growing so largely among the people that, whether we like it or not, we shall by-and-bye be in the position of having—however slow it may be—to undergo the process of surrendering to a system of scientific starvation. To advocate views of this kind, and to maintain positions of this kind, is not only most lamentable in itself, but it furnishes arguments to the sceptics we want to convince. A second difficulty I have found to have its origin in—the mysteries of God's providence in those fearful disasters that have occupied the public mind during the last few months. I have found that the simple faith of some of my Christian people has had a cold mist brought over it. They believe in God; they believe in God's goodness; they believe in God's love; but they say "is it possible that He

has forsaken the earth for a time?" And my only way of arguing with them is to remind them that when Christ, the expression of God's love, was on earth, there were similar trials of faith. In connection with his birth there were many women who would not be comforted for the loss of their infants slain by the sword; and when He left the earth, and wept over the city of Jerusalem, it was because He knew the sorrows that were to come upon it. What we have to teach our people is that, as a consequence of sin entering the world, not only is there moral depravity, but a clouded intellect, a perverted will, and a distorted judgment. By an error of judgment the helm is turned the wrong way, and hundreds perish; through the dull comprehension of a signalman the points are reversed, and along a wrong line a train rushes to its ruin. All these things are the result of the entrance of sin into the world. The present state of things is progressive and a period of probation rather than the full and final time of redemption. These things are taking place because the time has not yet come when we may say: "Thou hast put all things under His feet." We may look forward to that time when all these mysteries will have passed away. But in the meantime I try to go to the cross of Christ, and there I find the only consolation that can dispel the doubts and difficulties that surround us for a time, in reference to God's providential love and care. Another difficulty in connection with my own people, and especially among my young men, I find in the fact that they do not believe, or rather they only half believe, in the efficacy of prayer on special occasions. You well know how this subject has been discussed, and how a preceding speaker has said that the reign of law, and that which it represents, holds such a paramount authority upon some people's minds, that they think God himself must be subject to the regulation of His own laws. But surely we may try and explain to our people that whilst there are such things as laws in operation, nevertheless we see in nature considerable room for variation; and that after all, the best thing, if we want to understand what God can do, and what God may do, is to look not at the material world, but rather to look at man himself, for man is higher than the ground on which he treads. Man is made in the image of God, and if I wanted to learn God's character I would rather study man than seek hints from the running stream. In man I find certain things—I find that I possess freedom of will, or else I could have no moral responsibility; and yet I am ready to own that—

"There's a Divinity doth shape our ends
Rough hew them how we will."

I am a perplexity to myself, and examining myself, made in God's image, will not be discouraged because I find a like problem in God. When I look up to the throne of God, I cannot say that He is so bound by the necessity of his own laws and expression of his own will—that there is not to be that freedom of will for him, which may respond to the petition of one of his little children. It has been said that if we regard man in his best character—taking him as a judge sitting on the judgment seat, we shall find that he does not interpret the law by the strict letter of the law. Is there not such a thing as equity? May he not, therefore, in the administration of the law, attempt such possible variations, as may tend to the real administration of justice? Shall we not allow that same liberty to the divine Judge of all the earth who will do right? Man himself, let us remember, can alter the surface of the globe, so as to change the climate of a country to a certain extent. I read only the other day that it was proposed to block up the straits between Newfoundland and Labrador; and supposing the current thus stopped, the ice prevented going into the great gulf of St. Lawrence, the climate would in consequence be changed: and is man capable of changing the climate of a country, and God to be regarded as not able to direct the sun's rays, and not able to send

the showers in response to our prayers? To say this is to make man greater than his Maker. Another difficulty I have noted—and I hope my rev. brethren on the platform who are older than myself will pardon me if I speak with great diffidence about it—I do find, not only amongst the careless members of the congregation, but amongst the most spiritually-taught people, a great difficulty with reference—I will not say to that problem of eternal life which has been brought before us in certain books—I will not say even as to the perpetuity of punishment—but as to the character of it. I find that my best people shrink back from believing what some of the clergy still teach, and that is, the material fire. I put it before you as one of the difficulties, and I am sure that this question will have to be fought out, not altogether with the old arguments; and it would be well for the minds of the younger clergy and the faithful among our flock if some book on that question were put forth—some book, the result of deep thought, upon God's word; for it is appealing to God's word that these teachers propound their views. If some such book as "Aids to Faith" were put forth, I believe it would furnish great comfort and consolation to the minds of some of God's children, in this period of spiritual doubt and difficulty. Forgive me for stating this doubt; but I know that it exists, and we are bound fairly and fully to meet it. The great difficulty, however, arises from the inconsistent lives of professing Christians; and what was said at the beginning of the present century is equally true now, viz.:—"The arguments we want in favour of Christianity are not more Bampton lectures, but more lives like that of Henry Thornton. The strongest arguments for Christianity are to be found in lives conformed to the life of Him who went about doing good. A lady on the continent said to me a few weeks ago—"I do not understand this question of scepticism; but I do know that the only way to meet the evil and misery around me is, not the gospel preached by men of science of the present day, but the gospel of Him who was the Man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief."

Rev. Prebendary W. R. CLARK, of Taunton.

YOUR grace remarked in your address this afternoon that the character of the attacks made by unbelievers of the present day upon the Gospel were peculiarly thorough and elaborate. And perhaps this conviction can be thoroughly held only by those who are acquainted with the attacks made upon the Gospel outside our own country. There are few of us who are aware how much the peculiar relations between the Church and the State in England prevent open attacks against the Gospel. In other countries, where this condition of things does not prevail, these attacks are more explicit and more abundant. But there is one element of hopefulness in the nature of the attacks. My meaning will be plain, I believe, when I remind you of the classification of human thought, by Comtè. He said, there are three eras of human thought—the theological, the metaphysical, and the positive. Now I do not agree with him that this describes the history of human thought all over the world; but undoubtedly it does describe the history of a certain section of human thought; and the element of hopefulness to which I refer is this—that the unbelief of the present day has come into the positive era. We are no longer in the theological, no longer in the metaphysical, but we are in the positive era. We have been reminded of Butler having answered the attacks made upon Christianity from the point of view of Deism; and those who have read the late Mr. Stuart Mill's autobiography and his essays on religion, will remember that one of the most striking passages in his two books was that in which he states that Butler's argument as against the Deist was unanswerable and it was for that reason, he said, he

in early life abandoned Deism and adopted Atheism. Some can recollect as a matter of personal experience the state of unbelief about 30 years ago. We were then in the metaphysical, or the pantheistic period. Many of you are, no doubt, familiar with the name of Theodore Parker, and the influence which he exerted a few years ago. I think I am hardly exaggerating when I say that that influence has now almost entirely passed away. About that time the dominant influence on the Continent was certainly the influence of Strauss; and those who have followed the history of that remarkable man—whose character is deeply interesting to all—are of course aware that he deserted his pantheistic point of view, and descended to atheism and materialism. In the last production of any importance that came from him before his death, he declared himself substantially a materialist and an atheist; and abandoned the point of view taken up in his early life, the mythical, and adopted another. This I say is an element of hopefulness—that we have worked, so to speak, through the Deistic period, and the pantheistic period, and that we have got to the materialistic or positive period. I do not mean to say that these phases of unbelief will not return: we know that they return again and again: that error repeats itself in different ages; but they will not return with the same virulence, and we shall be able to point to the fact that they had lived and failed in the past, and that they could not hold their position. The hopefulness I see with regard to the present kind of attacks made upon the Gospel of Jesus Christ by positivism or materialism, is that it is impossible for a theory of that kind to maintain itself, I do not mean merely in opposition to man's intellectual connections: I do not mean merely in opposition to man's intellectual nature, which cannot finally acquiesce in it, and spiritual nature which craves for God; but I mean in view of the actual phenomena of social life. I should like to have said something on the former points. The Dean of Manchester has reminded us that the idea of a law implies a law-giver. I might go further and say that the very idea of law is the spiritual idea. Law is not an objective thing. You do not find law when you begin to cut and carve the material substances before you. Law is a subjective idea, which you find in your own mind; an inference which you draw from the facts of the external world. I might repeat that which has been said by Professor Watkins, in his very striking paper, that man has spiritual desires which nothing will satisfy but the knowledge of God itself. That is as true in this 19th century as it was in the day in which the great Bishop of Hippo (although not then a Bishop) penned it. He said "Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our heart is restless until it rest in Thee." But there is another aspect of this matter which has struck me more forcibly, and that is this—that positivism has nothing as a foundation for its present most powerful allies. I refer to the Social Democratic party, more especially in Germany and France. The Social Democracy at the present moment is atheistic but can they remain atheistic? What does Atheism say of it? What support can materialism give it? Whence does that party derive that portion of truth which it undoubtedly contains? What is that it is blindly seeking after and striving to establish? Is it not something like this—the brotherhood of mankind? But it will not find the brotherhood of mankind in positivism. It must go back to the One God and Father who made us, to the One Blood which was shed for us on Calvary, and to the One Spirit which was given us in Pentecost. I say this, therefore, these very considerations—this great party which is at the present moment allied with materialism and atheism, will find that it has departed from the principles it learned from the Gospel; that it has really no ground to stand upon; and that it will lead to the abandonment of that system which it fancies is inseparably connected with itself. If further progress, therefore, should be made in that direction, the result must be chaos. It is impossible for society to stand upon such foundations. And here I return to my first remark, that the elements

of hopefulness in the present condition of the attacks upon Christianity—that when chaos is come society will have to be reconstructed, and it can be reconstructed upon God alone. But although I speak thus hopefully of the future, I do not mean for a moment to imply that we are not to be watchful against the attacks of unbelief, and diligent in meeting them, and in fortifying the minds of our people against them. And on this point I should like to say a few words about some of the wrong ways of asserting the truths of Christianity against Infidelity. It is not uncommon—and I think more especially it is not uncommon among a certain class of very earnest men—many of them of the younger clergy—to urge that the way to get rid of unbelief—the way to lead men to believe is to have more dogmatic teaching. Now if by that be meant what, perhaps, ought to be meant—the joint utterances of the decrees of the Church—for I suppose dogmatic teaching means not positive teaching, not mere assertion, but the uttering of decrees—if it mean that we were all to say what the Church orders us to say, there might be something to say for it. For if the clergy show a loyal and united front to the world, doing unitedly and with one voice the work the Church has sent them to do, that would be a noble sight, and would exercise a good influence upon the world at large. But that is not what is meant by it. If it were meant that we were to add some unreasonable supernatural beliefs to the reasonable beliefs of Christianity, then, I think, it is the worst way of meeting Infidelity. If it is meant that a mere positive and dogmatic statement of things without any argument is to produce conviction, I can only suppose that it is meant by those who utter such statements, that there are a good many foolish people in the world who are convinced by a thing being said very positively, more than by any arguments offered in support of it. And that I should be very unwilling to deny, because, unfortunately, most of the errors of the present day, and of all days, are just those which received currency from ignorant people, who repeated them over and over again in the presence of people more ignorant than themselves. But if it be meant that that is the way to cure thinking men of unbelief; that that is the way to draw unbelievers to be believers in Jesus Christ, then, in the name of that God who gave us the power of thought and reason, I must protest against an assumption so monstrous.

REV. CANON GOVER, of Saltleystead, near Worthing.

IN the course of my life I have had a great deal to do with young men, and during the last few years, when remitted from active duty, I have been moving amongst the educated laity of the middle classes, and have found them speaking with more frankness and freedom to me than they would use to their pastors. And as a result of that, I would offer a few words on behalf of those who are apt to be classed as unbelievers, but who have really only some "doubts and difficulties in relation to revealed religion." There has been, I think, much harm done by speaking too absolutely as to who are believers and who are unbelievers, and that many have been driven away from the ranks of belief because their doubts and their difficulties have not been sufficiently tenderly dealt with. I need hardly say, because it has been said already, that these doubts and difficulties in a great measure arise from the progress of modern biblical criticism, and from the progress of modern physical science. It will not do that we should take up, as many have done, dogmatic theories of verbal and plenary inspiration, and utter them as though they were the answer to all these doubts and all these difficulties. Nor can those who have these doubts and difficulties feel that such is an answer to them. With regard to modern criticism, the results of which have been spoken of, we may have to admit, first of all, that, in respect of chronology, statements in correction have been really

proved; and again, that those passages in which great numbers are continually occurring—in the Old Testament particularly—are not the form in which these Scriptures were originally written, but that these numbers may have been exaggerated throughout. I have found, if we admit this much, men who have these doubts are at the first moment surprised with the frankness with which we meet them, and are more ready to receive it when we tell them that these matters do not affect the spiritual authority of the Scriptures. As to physical science, we have to take great care how, in this age of its progress, we press beyond its due bounds the requirements of a belief in the supernatural. What I mean is this—that there are many circumstances and events in the early history of the world which really need not call for the belief in the supernatural at all, because they might be resolved into physical appearances and physical phenomena. Nor do I think we lose anything in admitting this, provided we still keep fast hold of this truth—the Spirit of God working in man from the very creation of the world, through all his uprising, from the patriarchal dispensation up to the time when the Christ brought life and immortality to light for man. Perhaps I shall make myself more clear if I take one or two illustrations. I will take them from portions of Scripture which have been so recently brought before your attention as Churchmen. I refer to the lesson of last Sunday morning, belonging to the Feast of St. Michael and All Angels. You will remember in that grand and glorious chapter—the 32nd Genesis—you have an account of the two visions of Jacob at a period when his very life was at stake, the vision of God's hosts at Mahanaim, and the vision of the struggle with the Angel at Peniel, when he said he had seen the face of God. Now you will find persons asking—"Am I to believe that God on these two occasions actually made Himself apparent to Jacob?" "Are we called upon here to recognise something of which we have no experience, of which we cannot expect to have any experience when we are placed in similar spiritual circumstances?" May it not be an explanation of such a passage as that of the hosts at Mahanaim that, the wanderer in the desert, wherein he had passed his days and nights in solitude for so many years, saw, as he was returning to the home whence he had gone out, projected on the clouds at the angle of reflection at which he stood, that physical phenomenon which is known to moderns, and that what he saw there were vast gigantic forms of the two bands of his own families thus thrown before his sight. I do not say it was so; but suppose persons say that it was so, and that there is no need to call in the aid of the supernatural, does it at all follow that we have lost one iota of the beauty and of the strength of that passage in Jacob's life for the teaching of Christian life to us? Whether it was by that natural phenomenon of which Jacob knew not, or whether it was by the personal presence which he thought it was, nevertheless the vision was the means of causing his mind to dwell upon all that had happened concerning him, in those twenty years since with his staff he passed over this Jordan, and now, through God's mercies and truth, had become two bands. May we not teach that it was the Spirit of God speaking to Jacob's mind, just as much in this way as though we endeavour to impose upon others a belief in the supernatural? And so I might dwell upon the other passage.

REV. R. B. GIRDLESTONE, Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford.

MY LORD, I should not have ventured to come forward this evening were it not that I deeply feel the power of unbelief on one's own soul, living as one does, in an atmosphere of doubt and scepticism; and also because it has fallen to my lot to take part in some of the discussions with infidels which have taken place in Mr. Bradlaugh's hall, in London, of late years, and which have brought to my know-

ledge the thoughts and the ideas which the working-men have on the subject now before us. Man is a very composite creature, and he approaches unbelief from very various points of view. Some infidels are pure sensualists—their god is their belly; some infidels are intellectual—they are by force of reason brought, as they suppose, to certain conclusions inconsistent with the Christian faith; some infidels have a sort of moral sense or sensitiveness so highly developed that they see certain moral difficulties in the Bible with such clearness that they feel unable to hold what we hold. It is quite plain that these various classes of persons cannot all be dealt with in exactly the same way. Man is not pure mind, and we must therefore give him something more than pure reasoning. Looking back to Scripture, we find that our Lord was surrounded with infidels, with men who had such doubts and difficulties as exist now. Who can read the accounts of our Lord's dealings with the Sadducees without seeing that such was the case; or the 15th chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, without seeing that there existed in the Corinthian Church grave doubts on certain fundamental doctrines? How did our blessed Saviour and how did St. Paul deal with these matters? Our Saviour said to the infidels of his day, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scripture or the power of God." And St. Paul, in dealing with the Corinthians, held fast to another most precious and most valuable line of argument—the analogy from things natural to things divine. Never let us cast aside these three lines of argument—analogy, Scripture, and whatever testimonies you can find in your own experience to the power of God. With regard to analogy, it is surely a cheering thing, after what we have heard of late, to find that the publishers of Butler's *Analogy* have such a demand for the book that you can buy a good copy of it for a shilling at the railway stations; and the same may be said of Paley's *Evidences*. I wish that working-men could be taught by the clergy to read and study, and to master these two books. I feel convinced that it will be a long time before any two such books as these will be found to help us in our conflict with unbelief. And, with regard to the Scripture, has the day come when we can do without the law and the prophets? All men are agreed that we cannot give up the gospels, but are all Christian men agreed as to the Old Testament? Surely the day has not come for the Old Testament to be given up? We have not yet indeed secured for the Old Testament that which we have for the New. We have not men who can write for the Old as Dr. Sanday and Dr. Westcott have written for the New Testament. The materials do not exist, so far as we know at present, but they are daily rising to our hand. We have them from the land of Midian, from the Palestine Exploration Society, from Assyria, and from the Euphrates. The testimony of such men as Canon Rawlinson and others, who are spending their time and strength in working out the cuneiform inscriptions, is that they one and all bear witness to the accuracy of the Hebrew record, not against it. We, therefore, see strong reason to hold fast to the Old Testament as well as to the New. The truth is, that the New Testament and the Old are bound up together in far more senses than one. The prophecies in the Old Testament are absolutely necessary to our faith, for they are referred to in the New Testament as part of the line of God's providence which was destined to be carried out, and you cannot dissolve the connection between the Old Testament and the New, either in regard to prophecy, or history, or doctrine, without doing to the New Testament an irreparable injury. There was, you will remember, another line of argument which was used by our Saviour. He appealed to the power of God. Have we now no proofs of God's power to which we can appeal? It is true that a man of science will say, 'You have no miracles,' and we answer, "No we have not, and therefore you men of science cannot tell how to explain them." Science can only explain what it can get hold of, it cannot explain anything it cannot get a sight or hold of. If men of science could have miracles submitted to them, what would be the result? Simply

that they would have to enlarge their views of nature, and so of science. The stubborn facts would have to be dealt with, and philosophers would have to enlarge their generalisation of the laws of nature so as to include the new classes of phenomena thus brought under their notice. I regard miracles as proofs of the way in which God can step out of the ordinary bounds of nature so as to show that He has myriads of resources at His command, more than we know of at present. The age of miracles has passed, but we have other proofs of God's power. We have the history of the spiritual work of Christ from the day on which He died up to now. We have the results, not only in England but in all the countries of the world. We have the results of the reading of Scripture, the results of the feeding upon Christ, and the results of the sin-stricken consciences resting upon Christ. Go into the back streets of London, and what do you find—where Christian men are at work teaching Christ and Him crucified—you have the roughest of the rough and the lowest of the low being brought out of darkness into God's marvellous light. Is not this power? And if so, may we not appeal to those who are encompassed with doubts and difficulties and say, "Go to that Living Being, who died and rose again, and try if He has not something for you." If a Christian minister or working-man comes to his fellow-man in such a spirit and says, "I have tasted, come and taste too; I know in whom I believe, come and believe too." May not there be something there which, by God's mercy, may reach the sin-stricken, and bring him to peace, to comfort, and to rest? These are the things to which our strength must be given, not, of course, despising science, but keeping in the forefront as Christ and St. Paul did, the argument from Scripture, the argument from the power of God as exerted in the human soul, and the argument from analogy.

CUTLERS' HALL. TUESDAY EVENING.

OCTOBER 1st, 1878.

Chairman—Bishop of CARLISLE.

FREE AND OPEN CHURCHES.

The CHAIRMAN.

The subject which comes before you this evening is that of Free and Open Churches, and I hope we shall have a free and open discussion upon it. Any gentleman who wishes to address you will have the kindness, according to one of our rules, to send up his card, and it is then left to the chairman to deal as he may think best, with those cards. I pledge myself to deal with them in such a way as to produce as much controversy and pugnacity as possible, and I trust that no gentleman will feel himself precluded from taking a part in our discussion because he may have a very strong love for the old-fashioned square pews; and if there is any gentleman who wishes to fight the battle of the old square pew, I will undertake that he shall have a very fair chance.

Mr. BERNARD WAKE, of Sheffield.

The Church of England.—Did the ingenuity of man ever devise, or can the mind of man ever conceive, a more perfect system, for a nation's welfare, than that of the Church of England, in its two broad features whereby it provides,—(1) that every man, woman, and child shall have a parish clergyman (parson) to whom he or she can appeal, as of right, for ghostly comfort and counsel; and (2) that every man, woman, and child shall have a church to the floor of which he or she can go, as of right, and there, putting away the things of earth, commune upon the things of Heaven? England is often called "the mistress of the world"—"the evangelizer of mankind:" does her wonderful pre-eminence—and if you consider what a speck she is upon our globe it is wonderful—arise from some "great cause least understood," and is that cause the Church of England? If happily this be so, then great indeed is the duty incumbent upon us all to preserve intact that system which works such wondrous results. Surely it would be

"Pity to cast in endless shade,
What is so beautifully made."

The moral seems to be that parson and church alike should be preserved *free and open to all*.

When some person can establish a special claim to the parson's services, over-riding the claim of the general parishioners, we shall perhaps be able to see, that such person has also a special claim upon the floor of his parish church; but to claim the one without the other appears by no means easy. At present our parish clergy are "unappropriated."—(I except of course those appropriations of eligible young curates, by estimable young ladies, which are so consistently accomplished with such satisfactory results)—but as the same cannot be said of all our parish churches, I proceed to enquire what is their real condition. If I appear to dig down to the foundation needlessly, pray excuse me; I do it because there is deep-rooted evil which needs thorough eradication.

Free and Open Churches or Fettered and Shut—alias Pewed—Churches.—To which of these classes belong the old parish churches of England? to one or other class they must belong. After careful thought, and diligent inquiry, I have concluded that there is only one answer to the question, namely, that our old parish churches belong to "the free and open," class and that "fettered and shut—alias pewed churches" only legally exist as specialties, such as the chapels of noblemen who are entitled to appoint private chaplains, and chapels of ease, built under special Acts of Parliament, and the minister of which has no cure of souls. And first let us be clear what we are talking about;—"A pewed church" is one the compartments or apartments in which are private property—to be occupied, let, and sold at pleasure, on a par, in short, with flats in "Queen Anne's Mansions," at Westminster: more or less of "open house" may be kept in the pew or the mansion, but they remain private

property, however great the hospitality shown ; when a lady holds, as I have heard is or has been the case, 100 seats, we must hope that she is hospitable : and when gentlemen invest their mercantile savings in a goodly number of pews, we must wish them to be good landlords and have popular preachers to ensure good tenants. "A free and open church" is a "highway" and a "common"—nothing less—to be enjoyed without let or hindrance, save what the laws of order and natural politeness impose. If once we get fairly on our minds the proposition that the body of every old parish church in England is the "common" of the parishioners, a second proposition follows, namely—that encroachments made thereon deprive the poor of their inheritance, and tend towards the disestablishment and disendowment of that Church of England, which we so often call "the Church of the people."

Want of time will prevent my entering in detail upon small objections to free and open churches—in passing, however, let me remark that should the rich be really uncomfortable whilst exercising their "common rights"—after having relieved the pressure so much as possible by multiplying services and curates under the easy process of voluntary offerings to pay for them,—then the remedy is in their own hands, they must build new churches. What a glorious condition will England be in when her parish churches are thus crowded—regularly not spasmodically—and through the length and breadth of the land, and not merely at fashionable watering places or in densely packed towns ; I cannot fancy anything more satisfactory than the crowding of the poorer classes to their parish churches ; should this result in the positive exclusion of the rich—what then?—the rich will gladly make way for their poorer neighbours and allow them to use that "common" which, in the case I am supposing, has become too small to accommodate all. How the rich will enjoy building new churches because the *people's* pressure exhausts the people's church and the people's parson.

Reverting to the simile of "a common" as illustrating the position of our parish churches, let me observe that gradual encroachment on a common invariably leads to one thing—the extinguishing of the common—and when commons are extinguished and enclosed, another consequence also is invariable—the commoners' rights are always respected, always compensated—law and justice prescribe this, and law and justice will consequently distribute amongst the *entire people* of England those Church of England revenues, designed for and providentially—mysteriously if you like—handed down to us, the people of England, if not the people of England, but only a select few are permitted to enjoy them.

With pews in side aisles and galleries, and in "new parishes," time forbids me now to deal, except by the remark that if we can conclude that *old* parish churches should be "free and open" we shall have demonstrated that the same applies to *new* parish churches ; and I would very respectfully, but very earnestly, ask all those good men, who are building new *pewed* parish churches, to consider whether they are not disasterously invading that fundamental principle which requires that each parish church shall be "free

and open " to all parishioners ; my own conviction is that each such new *pewed* parish church is a *stepping stone to disestablishment and disendowment*, whilst each "free and open" church is a powerful magnet attracting back to the now enwarmed bosom of mother church—her alienated children.

A Theoretical Church.—Whether we regard churches as erected to enable men to "worship God in his sanctuary," and there declare "the wonders that He doth for the children of men," or to enable men therein to pray to God for "forgiveness of those sins which all have most grievously committed," the first essentially needful characteristic is *accessibility to all*—potentate, prince, peer, and peasant must have equal right to offer the "sweet incense of praise and thanksgiving" or the "sacrifice of a broken and contrite heart : " a theoretical church must then be "free and open" to all parishioners.

The Primitive Church.—St. Paul, at Mars Hill, found the Athenians worshipping "the unknown God," and to all there assembled, his voice proclaimed "whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you." Is it a fond conceit, or is it a solid fact, that St. Paul himself—that great apostle of the Gentiles—proclaimed the gospel of Jesus Christ on our shores,—who can tell? I am content to take it as a fact, and in fancy to picture that the preacher at Mars Hill repeated at Stonehenge the same glad tidings which he had first told to the Athenians. The Druidical temple on Salisbury Plain, and the temple to "the unknown God" would alike be "free and open ;" the whole world wanted St. Paul's teaching ; all were alike in darkness. I conclude, then, that at this date the "free and open" principle must have prevailed.

Our Parish Churches.—The actual origin of our parish churches is bad to trace—we may speculate and surmise—imagination may picture a Druidical temple converted into a Christian church, and such may have been the fact, but much obscurity prevails—there is, however, scarcely room for doubt that the great landowners of former days erected for the *whole* of their dependants those old parish churches which have come down to us. Now I need not dwell on this part of my subject, suffice it to say that there is not the slightest authority for supposing that these churches were built for any select part of the lord's dependants ; the churches were for *all* the "manorites" (if I may coin a word) ; for all who owed "suit and service" to the temporal lord, the church was provided wherein to do "suit and service" to the "great God of heaven and earth." My conclusion then is that our parish churches were in their conception and inception "free and open," and I know of no law which has changed this fundamental principle. The pew of the patron or of the lord of the manor are but exceptions, proving the rule that the body of the church was "free and open to all parishioners."

A Perfect Church.—A few months ago, a bright spring day spent at a little village in the south-west of England—all nature speaking of beauty, serenity, and gladness—introduced me to an intelligent guide, who enjoyed with me the peaceful scene all the more, because he was a "life-boat man," and, like St. Paul, had been "in

perils off." How we all do honour those brave fellows who man our life-boats and "leave all and trust in Providence," when duty's call, and the captain's signal, summon them out for their perilous enterprise to succour the distressed, no matter of what nation, colour, or creed they be; one's heart warms instinctively to a "life-boat man," and converse flowed freely with my comrade guide—how it did rejoice me to find that "the parson" was the head of the life-boat crew, that he was at the fore-front of all the village doings; the pivot, in fact, round which the village turned. To my enquiry—where is the church, where is the key? my guide replied, "the church lies snug behind yon trees, and as for the key, the door is never locked!" *Experto crede!* The church was open, I passed through its well-trimmed grave yard,

"And Norman arch and latchet loose,
Told ancient build and modern use."

"A perfect people's church" lay before me, "free, open, and unappropriated."

The picture was a bright one; it dwells clear and sharp on my memory now; church and lifeboat had one feature in common; danger—spiritual or bodily—alone was needed to evoke their best services; both were "free and open to all."

A Sheffield Church.—Now, if you will grant that this "free and open" Cornish church which I have introduced is a fair specimen of the churches which our forefathers designed for the people, and if you will grant—what I believe no one can gainsay—that the people were charged, by the law of England, with the maintenance of the bodies of their parish churches, because they, the people, had the use of what they so repaired, then we have to enquire whether in fact the churches of the present day answer to their original design, or have been so altered that the original design is often hardly traceable. I purpose to make the enquiry near home—at Sheffield.

If about forty years ago (September, 1839) you had gone to the Parish Church of Sheffield to attend divine service on Sunday morning, you would have passed through a file of armed constables at the gates; in the church you would have found a crowd of people whose behaviour evidenced that they were in a place *new* to them—that they had small ideas, if any ideas at all, of things sacred—the Chartist had claimed admission to their parish church—I was there, and can testify that the sight was unedifying. For three or four weeks the people's right was thus asserted; then one of Sheffield's most worthy merchants claimed his pew and took forcible possession: a brawl ensued: an outside man (*i.e.* a man not in the pew of which forcible possession was taken) interposed, and broke the law by creating a disturbance; the law was enforced; the brawler was apprehended, tried, convicted, and sentenced to two months' imprisonment; he was defended by "counsel learned in the law," by a gentleman whose now world-wide reputation speaks to the fact that what man's ability could do to save a prisoner from conviction and punishment was done; the counsel was the Right Honourable John Arthur Roebuck. Here, then, we have these

facts:—(1) A parish church whose area will not accommodate a tithe of the parishioners is pewed, appropriated, "private property." (2) A section of the parishioners, rebelling against exclusion force their way into their parish church. (3) A brawl, almost a riot.

Now, so far as the Chartist element is mixed up with this, or the element of indecent behaviour in church, I have not one word to say in defence of the convict; but it is worth our while to consider whether there is not an underlying cause giving rise to the offence, and for which cause the prisoner is to be pitied and the clerics of the *Church of England* and *pew owners* are to be blamed, or any way held responsible. The people of Sheffield had lost their birthright—their piece of common—the floor of the body of their parish church had been appropriated and enclosed and wholly wrongfully taken away from them. The hard, solid, undeniable, uncomfortable fact is, that in 1839 the people of Sheffield might (1) be baptised; (2) be married; (3) be buried—at their parish church, but they could not there be educated, instructed, admonished, or comforted; there the gospel could not be preached to them; Dives was in possession, Lazarus was shut out. Those pews with closed doors, comfortable cushions, and other "owners' marks," betoken that "private property" which Englishmen will not invade:—a man's "house is his castle," and his "pew is his house."—Trim the fact however you will, blame the poor for neglecting their Church, say that the rich only took what the poor despised, argue that the church would have been in ruins if the squires and the gentry, and the "well-to-do" had not rescued it, restored and pewed it, the fact remains, the poor man was ousted from his inheritance, the rich man alone was in possession. Think ye that these rich men were worse than the rest of the world? I trow not. These things were done by men for whom we entertain the highest respect, and against whom I have not one word to say, save that they were unwarily misled into committing an error the evil effect of which they would have been shocked at had they seen it—an evil effect not transient, but so permanent and so ineradicable that forty years have failed altogether to make any impression on it, though high authorities in the Church, and noblemen and laymen of great rank and intellect have combined to remove and cure the evil. "The Sheffield Parish Church" is pewed now as it was forty years ago!

Many who hear me well knew that man of strength and energy, that man whose memory all Sheffield respects, whose funeral called out the sympathy of the whole community, the Rev. Thomas Sale; he regarded those pews as a "stumbling block," as a "rock of offence." He tried to remove them; he failed. Does his spirit look down upon us now and rejoice at one more effort to destroy them? In all seriousness, in all earnestness, and with a sincere belief that the question is all important to the Church of England, I ask, "Could you blame, could you punish the poor (I wish I could find some other word than poor to express what I mean) if they now, from a good motive and with decency and order, took possession of the Parish Church floor by claiming of the churchwardens and officials due accommodation there; could you justify a pew-owner locking up his pew or requiring it to be reserved for him?

Are the pews bad in principle, as introducing an appearance of private property where public rights *alone* exist? Were pews erected, and are they now maintained under mistaken notions? Ought they to-morrow to be swept away from the floor of the parish church of Sheffield as being dangerous alike to rich and poor? Ought the floor of the Parish Church of Sheffield to be "free, open, and unappropriated?" Ye men of Hallamshire, these questions are homely ones—will you answer them? Do so, and then but one thing can result—the *Sheffield Parish Church free, open, and unappropriated!*

The Church of England.—One word more about the Church of England. It is unique; it lives either upon revenues handed down through such long ages that no one can clearly say who was the donor, or upon the voluntary offering of a grateful people; it impoverishes none, but is ready to enrich all. Who is the Church of England man or woman that will dare endanger the overthrow of such a system? I believe there is *no* one who would *knowingly* do this; but let pew owners, pew occupiers, and pew devisers beware; take away that feature "free and open," refuse to restore it where it has accidentally been lost, and such expressions as "Church of England," "Church of the people," "National Church," lose their meaning—then comes the tug of war—ten *pewists* against one hundred people; the odds are too great: superior numbers will in time prevail, and that grand bulwark of England, her Church, be overthrown. The "cloud no bigger than a man's hand" must not be despised, and, after giving the best thought I can to a subject, the importance of which has grown upon me day by day, since, happily for me, I took it in hand at the invitation of the Church Congress Committee, I say deliberately that, in my view, the base of the Church of England is the floor of her parish church, "free and open" to all parishioners; keep that base, build on that base, and no one need fear any hurt to the Church; but narrow the base of that Church by pewing out the mass of parishioners and pewing in a select few, and surely—perhaps quickly, perhaps slowly, but any way surely—the Church of England loses its balance and falls, and "great indeed will be the fall thereof." It carries, methinks, all too surely, England's greatness with it.

What ought to be done.—Time has given a semblance of right to what is in fact absolute wrong—pew property on the floor of parish churches. Bishops have by faculties (so-called, for, in fact, they lack authority to deal with parish floors by pew appropriation) intensified the pew system error, and the schoolmaster must be abroad, truths must be iterated and reiterated, facts must be told and re-told, ere the educated men and women of this nineteenth century will see how great is the wrong committed by fencing off the people from that rich inheritance, their parish church floors; for, bear in mind this one emphatic thing, the parson cannot get at the people effectually except he can not only talk to them in their homes and by the way-side, but invite them to "a free and open church." Oh! that every pew owner and pew occupier would answer the following questions:—"1. Do you own, did you pay for the soil of that old parish

on which your pew stands? 2. Do you own, did you pay for the bricks and mortar of the church in which your pew is? 3. Do you pay the parson who ministers in the church? 4. It is difficult for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven, and it is imperative that "the poor have the gospel preached to them"—are rich and poor in equal need of their parish churches?" Quiet, deliberate, conscientious answers to the foregoing questions will "fallow the ground" of our hearts and minds; the seed must then be sown by the clergy, to each of whom I would respectfully quote

"At morn sow in the seed;
At e'en stay not thy hand;
To doubt and care give thou no heed,
Broad cast it o'er the land."

Then, with gradually quickening speed the pews will disappear, and all England's parish churches be and remain free, open, and unappropriated for ever.

And now, finally, are the conclusions above drawn correct? Ought the parish churches of England to be free, open, and unappropriated? If the answer be "Yea, yea," then, dismissing all minor considerations, and refusing to be turned aside by seeming difficulties (there are none in fact) or plausible expedencies, it but remains that all, with a confiding faith, should adopt the royal language and say—

"Let right be done—
Such is the Nation's will."

Rev. W. MILTON, M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Sheffield.

FREE and open! The very sound is pleasant to every Englishman's ears, and awakens an echo in every true Christian's heart. Who pleads for or desires that any church should be *shut* against the poorest man that lives, or that no one should be accommodated therein without *paying down* his entrance money? No; churches are for the people. Everything ought to be done to welcome them in, and nothing to keep them out. Would that the people were found surging into them in such crowds that there was no room to receive them! And yet, if that happy consummation had arrived, some rules would be needful to preserve *order*, to secure *comfort*, and to maintain the *solemnities* of divine worship. All comers would not be allowed to rush into this or that part of the edifice: all could not possibly occupy the foremost place. Some must, of necessity, be less advantageously situated than others, and the complaints now frequently urged against the pewed churches would not be silenced, since all could not be reduced to perfect equality of accommodation. But this intense desire to crowd our churches does not exist, unless in a few exceptional cases in London, or at the sea-side, where either the accommodation is insufficient to meet the wants of the visitors, or the special attraction of eloquence, of music, or ritual, induces a

perpetual influx of strangers to be regaled with the entertainment, or to be gratified with the spectacle. Such instances, however, must be dealt with on their own merits, and can hardly be the material of a general discussion.

Fixing our attention, then, not on exceptional churches, but on the ordinary churches of ordinary parishes in our towns—to which my remarks are limited—let us see whether *one system only* is desirable for all places; or whether arrangements should not be made, varying in each case according to the special circumstances of each. For, after all, Free and Open churches, in the sense that everyone may go where he pleases and pay nothing at all if he so likes, are, I venture to affirm, in spite of their plausible and captivating title, neither *required by principle*, nor *recommended by policy*, nor *encouraged by results*, as a universal plan.

As a *theoretical* scheme, nothing is more attractive; but as a *practical operation* none demands more wise and careful consideration. The grand fundamental truth which is often laid down as the basis of all argument for free and open churches, namely, that we “are all equal before God,” and that we should, therefore, abolish all distinctions in his house, is a fallacy as *misleading as it is seductive*; for it is to confuse the MORAL RELATIONS in which we stand to our Maker with the SOCIAL RELATIONS in which we stand to each other. AS SINNERS we are, indeed, equally guilty before God; as REDEEMED by the blood of his Son, we are equally loved by Him; as SANCTIFIED by his Holy Spirit, we are equally “members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of his heavenly kingdom;” yet these glorious facts of our spiritual equality do not subvert the differences of education, of rank, or of station, any more when we have CROSSED the threshold of the sanctuary, than AFTER we have left it. COMMUNISM is not enjoined by the gospel in consecrated any more than in unconsecrated places.

With these prefatory remarks I venture to say again, that the making all churches free and open is—1ST.—NOT REQUIRED ON THE GROUND OF PRINCIPLE, WHETHER DIVINE OR ECCLESIASTICAL.

The second chapter of St. James' Epistle, second to fourth verse, is constantly quoted, as if it had been actually written to decide the question; whereas it denounces, not appropriation, but misappropriation, that is, all scornful and contemptuous treatment of the poor, and obsequious cringing to the rich. *Proper and considerate arrangements for all classes would render such cases as St. James condemns an impossibility.* Let the poor man's seat in the Christian synagogue be but *as good* as the rich man's—as near to the sanctuary, as close to the pulpit and the prayer desk, that he may *see* and *hear* and be *identified* with every act of worship—that is, let his seat be, as Lord Blandford's Act requires, (19 and 20 Victoria, c. 104, sec. 6,) “*as advantageously situated as regards position and convenience as the seats which are let,*” and both the letter and the spirit of St. James' injunction are fully complied with. It ought not to be overlooked that St. James deals with conduct towards the poor *universally*; and his mention of their unworthy treatment in the Christian gathering is but one illustration of his

charge against worldly-minded Christians, "Ye have despised the poor." It will go but a very little way towards obeying St. James ; in fact, it will be a *mere affectation of humility* for the man in "the gold ring and goodly apparel," to *sit* on the same bench, or to *kneel* side by side, or to *stand* shoulder to shoulder with the "man in vile raiment" in the house of God, and then to keep him *at full arms' length* everywhere else. Such cringing to the poor is, I deem it, but a thinly-disguised hypocrisy, which will neither conciliate the affection nor win the respect of honest-minded poor either to Churchmen or to the Church. Say what we will, the *comfort* and the *welfare* of all—aye, and the *cultivation of every Christian grace*—are best promoted by every person knowing his place and keeping it, whether in worship or in work, in the house of God or in our own.

Nor does *ecclesiastical* any more than scriptural principle demand this levelling system. In the synagogue of the Jews "the people sat (so Vitranga says) *according to their rank*, for instance, those of the same trade sat together." In the early church, Bingham says, (8 Book 5 ch. 2 sec.) the people filled the nave, "having their different stations or apartments in it according to the difference of *age*, or *sex*, or *quality*, or *state*, and *condition*, which distinctions were anciently observed in some, though not perhaps in all the churches." So also amongst ourselves, while the common-law right of the people to a place in their parish churches is undeniable, they are not by law at liberty to choose their own place, but the churchwardens, as the officers of the bishop, are required "to seat the parishioners according to their order and degree."* So much, then, as to the scriptural, ecclesiastical, and legal principles in reference to free and open churches.

II. And what principle does not require is, I believe, *EQUALLY OPPOSED TO POLICY*. The question is often argued as if the Church were composed of only one class, instead of embracing all classes ; hence any other than the free and open system is charged with *excluding* the people from the house of God ! "The slightest aspect of appropriation (it has been said) in a church keeps away the poor, deters those who are not regular attenders, and thereby tends especially to neutralise the Church's home missionary work, and so to perpetuate the alienation of the masses." Again, "A poor man will naturally turn back at the threshold, if a cushion, or a prayer-book seen here and there, leads him to think that he may, if he seats himself, possibly be taking the seat of his richer neighbour."† Boldly and frequently although this is stated, I believe it to be very incorrect, except with people who have imbibed the principles of ecclesiastical communism in their narrowest and bitterest form. If this *levelling law of self-will* is to prevail in religion, why not in every department of life ? No, no. Whatever causes of alienation of the poor there may be (if such indeed there be, although I do not believe they exist, except in certain localities, of which, thank God, Sheffield is not one), they lie deeper than the existence of pews. Only let the pastor in any parish or district be "a man after God's

* Archdeacon Denison, Oxford Congress.

† Mr. Herford, Oxford Congress.

own heart,"—loving, zealous, true-hearted—carrying out the system of the Church, in the catholic, evangelical, yet protestant spirit of the Reformation, and *pews* or no pews, *let* or free, *appropriated* or open, the people will gather around him,—wherever it can truly be said, "the poor have the gospel preached unto them."

But while it is our bounden duty to pay the utmost respect to the wants and to the wishes of the poor, are we to disregard the feelings of all who are not to be classed in this category—that is, of *every class* indeed, but the lowest? The pew-renting community is not one class, but all classes except the poorest; it includes the *employed* as well as the employer, the *warehouseman* as well as the merchant, the *smaller* shopkeeper as well as the largest manufacturer, all, in short, who like to have a place in God's house which they may call *their own*, and for which they are able and willing to pay a regular rental. The unsettlement, the division of families, the discomfort which almost inseparably attend free and open churches in towns, where the services are attractive and the preaching good, (for of half empty churches, and those in the country, where other elements come into the question I do not speak) so interfere with the calm serenity of mind essential to holy and profitable worship, that we have to dread the *alienation of the better classes by a universal open church system, as much as of the humbler portion of society by undue extension of pews*. Instances might be quoted of the sober families of a parish being either driven from the church, or banished to the remotest parts of the building, by an inundation of youths and girls who will come together, especially on Sunday evenings, rather for pastime than worship, and who contribute nothing to the support either of the church or its services. The demand appears but little short of extravagant that all the regulations of a church should be made with reference to those who come *but occasionally*, or *come not at all*; and that the possibility of doing good to the *irregular few*, should cause the dissatisfaction of the *regular church-going many*.

III.—Again; as the universal establishment of free and open churches is not *required by principle*, nor *recommended by policy*, so I believe it is not *encouraged by results*.

By results. I mean simply those which are tangible, such as offerings for the *support of the clergy*, for the *maintenance of divine worship*, and for *benevolent or missionary operations*. The increase of congregations, the spiritual progress of the people, and the effect on the number of communicants, important as these results are, I have not the means of knowing on an extended scale; and individual cases do but little in settling the question.

The weekly offertory must therefore be regarded as a *necessary adjunct* to the free and open system where the endowment for the clergy is insufficient, or there are no special resources for church expenses. To some persons this is a powerful argument in its favour. Led, or rather *mised*, by an erroneous application of St. Paul's command to the Corinthians, 1 Cor., xvi. 2, "*to lay up at home in store whatever he may, by prosperity have acquired*"—(I give Dean Alford's translation, because it seems more exact than

our own)—is surely an injunction rather to *save up* the money than to *pay it down* week by week; and he who has so saved his money is obeying the apostolic precept when he pays his *pew-rent* *quarterly*, as truly as he who *pays it every Sunday* by 104 instalments. For disguise it as we will, the *offertory is nothing more or less than a perpetual demand of pew-rent—acceptable*, I grant, to some—*repulsive* to many—injurious to not a few, by teaching them to minimize their contributions, and *evaded* by more who frequently refuse to give anything at all. The testimony of one clergymen is, “offertory mainly contributed by a few. The majority give little, some nothing at all.” * Another says, “everything has been done which circumstances admit of, to attract the people to their parish church, yet the congregation continues to diminish; and I am reluctantly forced to the conclusion that the people are tired of *having collections* every Sunday. The parish and people are, as indeed I always feared, unfavourable for such an experiment. The poor keep away altogether.” “I believe the offertory system to be an *utter delusion* and a snare where you can get voluntary rates, and where you have a scattered and agricultural population,” is the voice of one. “I believe a *much larger sum would be raised by pew-rents*,” says another.

But while the offertory system may sometimes meet the church expenses, it seems almost always to *dry up the stream of Christian benevolence and missionary effort*. Hear the six-fold testimony recorded in the pamphlet of “Facts and Opinions” published by the London Free and Open Church Society itself, from which I have already quoted. I take these six cases exactly as they stand in the pamphlet, page 61:—No. 1. The offertory “*completely shuts out* special and missionary collections.” No. 2. “It *bisects* them.” No. 3. “Has *reduced* them to about one-fifth.” No. 4. “We grudge special collections, as they *tend to cripple* us.” No. 5. “Affects the *priest’s stipend*, as there is no endowment.” No. 6. “*Always spoils them!*”

I am fully aware that *testimonies of an opposite kind* may be alleged, as they copiously are in the same tract from which I have quoted; but what do they prove, but the fact that much depends upon the locality, and still more, probably, upon the zeal or talents of the individual clergyman; and hence I maintain that it is a *most rash and ill advised thing to make war upon a steady reliable source of income like pew-rents*, in favour of so precarious a means as the *free seats and the offertory*, especially when we are able to add that for charities abroad, as well as for self-support, the pew-rented churches will bear a very advantageous comparison with those which are free. As mere illustrations I mention that last year the *pew-rented churches* of NOTTINGHAM sent some £1600 for the Church Missionary Society; while those of Sheffield contributed little short of £2500. It would be rather difficult, I think, to surpass such offerings in a corresponding number of churches which are open and free.

* See *Free and Open Churches. Facts and Opinions from Five Hundred Parishes*. London Free and Open Church Association, page 58, No. 26, 493.

Yet if, as I believe, neither principle, nor policy, nor results urge the universal adoption of the free and open system in our churches, what is the issue to which we are brought but this:—

1. To recognise the fact that all systems have *their weak as well as their strong side*, their advantages and recommendations as well as the reverse, and that a scheme which would be admirably adapted for one locality would be most ill-advised in another; and therefore to denounce the pew system as *sinful, selfish, and unchristian* is as unwarrantable as it is untrue. Let the *abuse* be denounced, but not the use of pews and pew-rents.

2. That in districts where the population is wholly or chiefly of the working classes—the churches should be *very largely if not ENTIRELY free and unappropriated*.

3. That where the *wealthy or well-to-do* classes ABOUND, pews are almost a necessity to secure the regular attendance and comfort of the families.

4. Yet that in every case *ample and comfortable provision* be made for the poor, that they may enjoy a *really free and open church; which they can alone do where the wealth of the rich supplies the deficiencies of the poor in the maintenance of divine service*. Only in pew-rented churches can the poor have “the gospel without money and without price,” and not be haunted by the perpetual begging-box.

5. That in no case should the rental of pews be regarded as other than giving *priority of claim for the use of the seat*; all seats should be free and open to all comers, under well-considered regulations, *when not filled by the renter*.

6. That only by pew-rent is anything at all obtained from the *selfish, the niggardly, and the parsimonious* for church purposes; and since such rental is paid to meet the convenience of the individual, every man should feel that his *offerings to God* are to be as independent of the *rental of his pew*, as of the rental of his dwelling-house.

7. Lastly, that in large towns, amidst many temptations to unsettlement, the pew system secures better than any other *regularity of attendance, binds the people to their clergy, ensures help and support for schools and other institutions, and, above all, prevents the mischief of people becoming Religious wanderers, Spiritual vagrants, Christians unattached*, who have a seat in every church, but a HOME in none.

The Right Hon. the EARL OF WHARNCLIFFE.

I SEE that the speakers here are put like sandwiches—first the bread, then the meat, and now the bread again. I do not know whether the next speaker will represent the meat; but I intend to take the same line as was taken by my friend Mr. Wake. It is not my object to answer in detail the remarks of Mr. Milton, but what I have to say may, in some degree, answer what he has said. I have many times spoken on the subject, and therefore I fear there is very little fresh on my part to say; the last time was at Bradford, where my friend Lord Nelson was present, as also several other gentlemen whom I see here on the platform. As regards the

"openness" of the Church, I think that there is a great deal to be said upon that question as to the locality. I have always held myself that in towns it is no doubt desirable that churches should be left open for the use of those who are inclined to go into them at all times of the day; but I should not like to say that I think it is a positive rule which is never to be altered, in any case, because I know I have noticed in reports circumstances which have occurred in churches where not only petty thefts have been committed, but acts of desecration in the sanctuary itself. But in a town, where there is always a possibility of somebody being left in charge of the church, it seems to me always desirable that the churches should be left open for the purpose of private prayer by the inhabitants of the town. In the country the matter must rest in the discretion of the clergyman. Now, as to the objections to appropriated seats—I really dare not say a word about pews, notwithstanding Mr. Milton's advocacy of them, because I never yet came across a single soul in my life who stood up for pews. I have known people in favour of appropriated seats, but I cannot say I have ever heard of anybody who stood up for pews generally, except when the chapels are attached to very large mansions. I have never known churches built deliberately, with large wooden pews, such as those we used to sit in when we were children; but there are, no doubt, a number of churches built with appropriated seats, and it is against that appropriation of the body of the church that the Free and Open Church Association have always waged war, and still continue to wage war, and until they are satisfied with the result of the war which they are waging, intend to wage war. Now, the objections we make are as follows:—First of all, as regards the distinction of ranks. There is no doubt that those who most require favour in church are not the rich men, and those well-to-do men who can be looked after and taken care of by everybody desirous of being subject to them: but it is the poor, with no one to help them at all. Another thing is, the education of the poor is, generally speaking, very imperfect—which makes it very hard for them to catch the meaning of words or sentences, either in the liturgy or sermons, when they are put at such a distance that they cannot hear readily what is read or said. Another thing is, that at home the poor have very few books to read on Sundays, and their houses, being very small, are consequently very noisy and very crowded. Now, all these reasons are, I think, cogent why it should be made as easy as possible for the poor to be placed in church in such a way that they should hear as well, if not better, than their richer brethren. The next objection is, as regards restriction of accommodation. Now it is impossible for anybody to think that churches, when they are appropriated, can ever hold such large congregations as churches which are entirely unappropriated; and for this simple reason, that when churches are appropriated you will find that persons do not sit as close as they can. But when a person holds so many seats, even when he does not fill them all with his family, he does not think it incumbent on him to go and fill the vacant seats up. It is, therefore, a fact that appropriated churches, except under the most stringent conditions, such as a very popular preacher, or some occasion like a harvest festival, which calls the multitude together, are not so closely filled as a free church. Again, in these free churches it is almost invariably the practice to multiply the services much more. If these churches are appropriated, and the services more numerous, evidently so much the greater in proportion is the mischief done: the evil is greater the more the services are. There is more and more space lost in the church. The next point is in regard to the arrangement of seats. Now we know that one of the chief objections we hear is the assignment of seats, because there is no doubt that when seats are assigned, you will always find that the best seats are assigned to those who have the most weight and influence in the parish. It is not the poor who shall be considered, but those most desirable to please on the part of the churchwardens or the vicar. But then, again, if such be the case, if those seats

are so appropriated, why is it that the poor are to be kept out every Sunday? Surely if they are to be fairly treated, they ought to be shifted every Sunday, and they ought to get their own turn at the good seats; instead of which you put a man into the very best place, and for every Sunday—fifty-two times in the year, besides festivals—he has that place. If there ought to be a re-distribution, it ought to take place every Sunday. You should not allow every rich man to have all the plums of the church, and the poor man to have all the suet outside. There is another evil also connected with the appropriation of the seats, and that is as regards any strangers or visitors coming to the churches. Many a time it has happened to myself, and I dare say to a great many others here, that one has felt very reluctant indeed to go into a church, not knowing whether one can get a seat or not; and I do not know anything more objectionable than for ladies to have to stand in the aisles until the prayer is over, and the churchwarden can supply them with seats. It is very objectionable to stand and be stared at by a whole congregation. It has often happened to me that when I have gone into a church and asked for a seat, they have said, "They will find you a seat." Then I say, "No, thank you;" I do not want to look for a seat, but there I am, standing in the middle of the aisle, I dare say in a very interesting position for spectators, but in a very unpleasant one for myself. These are the feelings of many upon the subject. As I said before, this system of appropriation has tended strongly to the exclusion of the poor from the parish church. But there is one other point I wish to touch upon, and that is as regards the effect which this has upon the Church of England. Now, I am quite sure of this—and I am convinced of it the longer I live and the more I think on the matter—the Church of England must be eventually doomed to disestablishment and disendowment if we do not attend to this end very soon indeed. And why do I say that? Because I am quite sure we shall never cease defending the church, and the other party will never cease attacking it. Until you can prove that the large majority of the people belonging to the church, and wish to promote the interests of that church, you may depend upon it our chief argument is done away with, and when that is so, nothing will stand very long, unless it has a good sound basis on which to rest. One of the greatest bulwarks of the Church of England would be that every church in the country should be free for those to enter in and worship in who like; and by that means you can maintain the bulk of the English people as supporters of that Church. I will now conclude, ladies and gentlemen, by reading an extract which I took up the other day in a pamphlet which formed a lecture delivered, I believe, by the member I see there (*indicating*), and who was then Archdeacon Sandford:—"Is it not hypocrisy to profess to build churches for common use, and then to appropriate them to a class; to bemoan the ungodliness of the poor, and then to deny them the means of religious instruction; to prate about the gospel, and then to exclude those who have most need of it; to make our boast of Scripture, and profess to believe every tittle of it to be the Word of God, and then to ignore some of its plainest precepts?"

[Here the chairman's bell rang, the time allotted his lordship having expired.]

Rev. W. LEFROY, Liverpool.

WHILE listening to the observations of some of the preceding speakers, my mind went back to some very telling essays that have been recently written, and amongst them I remember one very incisive expression. The essayist says that it is possible for a man to hold a sixpence so closely to his eye as to render the observation of all

external things well nigh impossible. Will you, my lord, allow me to use this simple illustration, in order, if possible, to bring before the minds of those who form this gathering,—the man of one idea. Such men were, I am bound to say, in bygone days, the advocates of pewed churches; and some of those men are—will you forgive me for saying?—in our present day, the advocates of free and open churches. With regard to pewed churches, I have this to say,—that churches should have been erected, and that there should not be in those churches accommodation for the poor, suitable as regards position, and ample as regards accommodation, and then called parish churches, is to my mind most disastrous for the Church, most distressing, and I believe illegal. For, by the goth canon, churchwardens are diligently to see that all parishioners resort to their parish church; “and all such as shall be found slack or negligent in resorting thereto, they shall earnestly call upon them, and if they mend not, they shall present them to the ordinary.” Now we all know that the observance of the canon is simply impossible. Indeed, this canon and others remind me of the accordance there is between some canons and rubrics and old garments: they are tight where they should be loose, and loose where they should be tight. Nevertheless, the canon shows to a demonstration that in the parish churches there is to be ample accommodation for the parishioners, and that is to be without hindrance or let, pecuniary or otherwise. Unhappily, in the outgrowth of affairs, these hindrances have not only been tolerated by the bishops, but absolutely encouraged. They are diminishing; and while taking the most serious exception to the sentimental—for I never heard such sentiment in my life as I have heard to-night—the sentimental statements, the extravagant statements that are made upon the subject of free and open churches, yet I entirely accord to their advocates the great credit of rivetting public attention upon a state of things which, generally speaking, is in my mind, to use the words already used here, both selfish and sinful. Nevertheless, I am not going to hold the sixpence to my eye. And therefore I will ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to take a simple and a practical view of this subject. I believe that in the good old Church of England there is room enough for both systems. I believe—to sum up my belief on this subject in one sentence—that we must have some churches in which every seat, from chancel to font, is free as the gospel of the blessed Saviour. But “all free?” No, not all churches. I believe that we may not have all churches with all seats free; and I also believe that we may not have any church without many seats free; and the position of the seats deserves, I think, a special mention. I hope the day is long since gone by when the seats will be divided, as in some cases unhappily they are, from north to south. Let the seats be divided directly from east to west, just as this room is. The free seats are not to be all behind pillars, or in the sides, or in the top gallery; the seats for the poor are to be, as I have previously said, suitable as regards position and ample as regards accommodation. Why should we hesitate to acknowledge the truth of this? Both systems, I would ask you to remember, are recognised by the law of the land; both are accepted by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners; and, worked honestly together, they violate no principle whatever. They illustrate that elasticity, which I believe is one of the grandest characteristics of the Church, which seeks to exclude in her ministrations all social grades. I know full well that some men will remind me of what has been referred to to-night, viz., the glory that is to break down all social distinctions in, and someone should I think say, parenthetically, out of, God’s house; and men think they have done this for the advantage of the poor, when they have placed the navy in his fustian and clogs beside the nobleman in his broad cloth and kid. I am surprised that the noble earl who preceded me did not cite that incident, which I have scarcely ever yet attended a free and open church meeting without hearing cited, and if you will bear with an old thing, I will tell it. His grace the Duke of

Wellington was once attending divine service ; and when he entered the house of God, he took his place in the seats that are set apart for the poor. An old sexton, who was rather drowsy, was galvanised into spasmodic activity by the presence of the Iron Duke ; and he straddled down the aisle, and said to the old warrior, " Oh pray, your grace, these seats are for the poor." " Very well," said his grace, " if the seats are for the poor, they will do for me ; no gentleman minds sitting beside a poor man." But I would take leave to remind the representatives of his grace here, that there is another side to that picture, and that is, that the poor mind sitting beside the rich ; and you never made a greater mistake than to put rich men and women side by side with the poorer classes of the population. I know churches, in Liverpool and elsewhere, where the poor have a distinct option of either taking rented seats or free seats ; and I know a church in Liverpool which was packed to the very doors, where the poor men pay for their seats, and ask particularly so to do. And the reason is that prevailing feeling, so deep seated in the hearts of thousands of Christian people—they love to sit beside their children in divine worship, and the children like to sit beside their parents. I will put it to you, my reverend brethren ; have you never seen the grey-haired father and the aged mother gently arranging those whom they have brought up in the sanctity of the Lord, in order that they may kneel at the Lord's table together ? I believe that this meeting, or any other meeting, never made a greater mistake than when you thus attempt to stamp out this pure domestic feeling, because of one of the most sentimental ideas that ever possessed the minds of men of one side ; and I close the half-minute now left me by saying that I heard with distress, and I heard with sorrow and with shame the language in the first paper, and which, in my mind, was little less than inciting the poor of Sheffield to resort to mob law.

MR. B. FLETCHER, President of the Sheffield Working Men's Church Defence and Reform Association.

BEFORE commencing to address you upon the subject which is before the meeting, just let me say that, although I may possibly differ somewhat from Mr. Wake and the noble earl who has just addressed you, as a working man I reciprocate the noble sentiments that they have uttered in regard to my order. In considering the question of " Free and Open Churches," it may be at once admitted that if any parish or congregation should think proper to adopt it as a system there can be no objection. But when it is proposed as a compulsory " panacea" for all the ills which attend our Church, it will be as well for us to spend a few minutes in a careful examination of some of the arguments and statements which are advanced in its support. In the first place, it is assumed that the pew system has driven the people away from the Church. If it is so, how is it that in many places where we find a " free and open church" about half full, that the working classes of the neighbourhood will build a chapel, and have it crowded, and it shall be conducted on the very same principles which it is said have driven them away from the church. Again, I ask, how is it, if the people have been driven away from church through seat appropriation that they are so ready (and those of the poorest class) to carry on of their own accord the same system among themselves ? The next point which is assumed is, that if myself and family go to church and pay for our seats, we exclude some one else and his family. It is assumed that, by some wonderful process which cannot be accounted for, we are grown larger than we were when we sat in unappropriated ones : that we take up more room by

going to our appointed places in order, than we did when we dropped in anywhere, or had to scramble for a place. I want to know what difference there can be, as regards shutting out, if you take your place either in an appropriated seat, or on a free one? If you go to church and there is not room for all, you must exclude some one, that is, if all want to go. The only logical conclusion I can draw from some of the statements made by the advocates of the Free and Open Church Association is, that if one part of the people of a parish are of the church-going class, and the others are not, the church-going portion must not by any means go, for fear they should prevent some one getting the best place who may not have blessed the church by his presence for seven years previously. But perhaps as I am a working man, and one who has taken an active part in matters affecting the church from my youth up, it may not be out of place if I give a little of my own private experience in the matter. I have been in the habit of attending all sorts of political meetings in various parts of the country for upwards of a quarter of a century, where I have heard almost every grievance brought against the Church that the imagination could desire, by men who have been employed to find out all her weak places. I have known men who have made it their study to magnify her smallest failings into gigantic crimes; and yet I have never once heard the pew system brought into question. I have listened with the profoundest attention to two of Mr. Joseph Arch's great orations against the church; but I never heard him utter a word against either the pew or appropriation system. And as far as I have been concerned, I never felt it any degradation to sit in a free seat, while my neighbour has sat in one appropriated. I have never felt it to be a grievance when those who could afford it have thought proper to pay a stated sum for the convenience of themselves and families. It is well known that the whole of society in England is made up of social distinctions: it runs through everything with which we have to do, from royalty down to the very lowest scale. It exists in the shop, the road, and the railway, and I have never heard any generally expressed desire on the part of my fellow working men to break them down. To illustrate my argument: I suppose when the noble earl who has just addressed us retires from this room, he will be attended by all the paraphernalia befitting his exalted station: while I shall be contented to walk to my humble home. Shall I be less a man, or less an Englishman, for that? Shall I fall foul upon his lordship and tell him that he is excluding me from the street, because he is taking up more room and appearing to better advantage than I am? I say no; believing that my services in my humble station are as acceptable to God and my country as are those of the most exalted person in the land, and that it is my duty, as a consistent member of the Church of my fathers, to be content and "do my duty in that state of life unto which it shall please God to call me." And with regard to the mass of the people being shut out, I have been a regular attendant at Church ever since I was a boy, and I have never been refused admittance into a church, but have, on the other hand, invariably been received with kindness and attention; and the only time that I have been requested to move from the place selected was in a "free and open" church, when I accidentally selected the only appropriated pew in the church, and that was the one belonging to the parson's wife. Then, again, do the working men attend in greater numbers where the churches are free and open than they do where there are rented or appropriated pews and free sittings? Well, as far as I have been able to ascertain, they do not. Then, again, as to the offertory system, I have found that when I have attended churches conducted upon the "free and open" principle, that when I have induced others to go with me, as has been my custom, I have generally found that they would not go again, as, perhaps for the first time for many a year that they had entered a church, they had a bag or a plate placed before them for money. My opinion is, after very careful

observation as a church worker, extending over many years, that the working classes much prefer the mixed system as now carried on in many churches in Sheffield, especially where the seats are all alike, and where the collections are at intervals of a month or so, to the offertory system, where they cannot go to church without being asked for money. Another argument advanced by the supporters of this theory is, that the working classes cannot afford to pay pew rent, or give such amounts as would secure appropriation; but the fact of so many large and beautiful Dissenting chapels springing up, in many cases long before a church is thought of, and conducted upon the plan of appropriation, is a complete refutation of such an idea. In fact, I do not know of anything that the working classes will not support when handled properly. Do not they support their racing establishments, their places of amusement, and have they not answered nobly to the call made upon them to help to support our public charities? And I would say to the clergy present, throw yourselves more upon their sympathies, show them that you are one with them, and then you will not find them backward in contributing to the support of their church to the utmost extent of their means. And now I must say a word about the hard things said by the advocates of this "free and open system" about the present church-going people keeping others out. I think, as a working-man, when I look around and see in this Sheffield of ours, between twenty and thirty churches built for the benefit of my order by public subscription and private munificence, and at the present time see from twenty to thirty thousand pounds spontaneously subscribed for the same purpose, I shall be slow to receive the keeping-out theory. And again, if we look at the country at large, we see that in the present century the number of clergy have been doubled, upwards of three thousand new churches have been built within the last forty years, and something like £26,000,000 have been spent over building and restoring cathedrals and churches. At the present time about six thousand curates are employed solely for our benefit, and something like £4,000,000 have been given by churchmen within these forty years for the purpose of educating our children. After looking the above facts fully in the face, one must come to the conclusion that it is anything but a wise policy for our brother Churchmen to be telling the world, and more especially the masses in our streets, by handbills and pamphlets, that although all this has been done, yet they are shut out of the Church by their richer brethren. I would ask my brethren to pause before they adopt such means to carry out an idea. I know there are thousands of my fellow working men who will look at these things calmly and take such statements for what they are worth, inasmuch as they know that their attendance at any of the churches is hailed with delight, and as the demand for room arose, ample provision would be made; yet there are others, with less information and under the influence of teaching which is adverse to our Church, who will be ready to lay hold of the slightest argument or statement that can be used to bring that grand old institution, which is so dear to us all, into discredit in the minds of the people. Then again, it must be admitted that the word "free" has a peculiar charm, and I would beg to remind my audience that it is not the first time we have heard it. We have before heard of a "free church," "free churchyards," "free land," "free capital," and last, but not least, "free love." And again to tell the people that they have a right to all the advantages of the Church, with the exception of paying to it, is only to lead them astray; and to count upon the whole of the people of the parish as having a claim upon the Church is, to say the least, open to some qualification. I know that old Acts of Parliament can be quoted to show that such is the case; but we must bear in mind that these Acts were passed when our fathers were all supposed to be of one religion, and not split up into about 150 sects as they are now. I know it has a good sound to put a tract into the hands of a man in the street, quoting the canons as to the duty of a churchwarden; but I

would ask if there is a man before me who professes to act up to the canons? If he does, in some parishes he will find very few people indeed who have any right or claim upon the Church. I would more particularly draw his attention to the 10th, 11th, and 12th canons to show how the canons would deal with schismatics, conventicles, and constitutions made in conventicles. I know the force of the canons is a disputed point, but as long as they are quoted to me and the multitude as being of authority, I ask your indulgence for referring to them. I cannot think that Dissenters and Roman Catholics, now they are released from all responsibilities concerning the Church by special Acts of Parliament, and having repudiated her, can have the same claim upon her as they had before these Acts were passed for their benefit. Taking that into consideration, the thousands mentioned in some of the hand-bills I have seen during the past week as being shut out of the Church will be reduced to hundreds, unless we look upon the churches and churchyards as national property, and that we can by no means admit. In conclusion, I would say to our friends that they have done something to place before the people a grievance of which they were quite unaware.

DISCUSSION.

Mr. COLLINS, Knaresbro'.

THIS is not the first occasion on which I have had to speak in Yorkshire upon the question of free and open churches. We may regard free and open churches as a convenience to the public, and as a mode of admitting more persons to the parish churches, or, in a far higher light—as one of Christian communism, if you like to call it that, in the house of God, where men ought to be equal, if they are not in any other place. Now, as to the question of convenience, I think no one can doubt that an unappropriated church will accommodate a far larger audience than an appropriated church. Why, in every-day life, supposing we travelled by train, and we had special places allotted and taken, you would have, of course, just as many railway carriages put on, whether everyone had his own seat kept for him, and whether he was going or not. Earl Wharnclyffe sits in the House of Lords, where there are no appropriated seats, except for the bench of bishops, and those seats are only appropriated in a certain way; the bishops sit by themselves because, I suppose, they are too good and too exalted to sit with their brother lords. The House of Lords will perhaps accommodate 300 persons, and there may be 500 peers. Well, if every person had his seat appropriated, the place would have to be twice as big. They do not all go there at the same time, nor stay the whole time when they are there. Take the House of Commons—650 members are the number of the house, but the House of Commons will only hold 400, and nobody there has his own seat appropriated. Mr. Spencer Stanhope, who sits behind me here, must find his place where he can. If you are to build our churches so large—large enough to accommodate every person in the parish—first of all, it would be far too costly, and when all the parish were not there, you would lose the warmth which you have by the concentration of force, and therefore it is idle to suppose that a system of appropriation in parish churches will give the same accommodation as where seats are not appropriated. And then we are told that the poor man shall have his share; but you know in this country, and in all other countries, the poor are the legion, the multitude, and if the poor are to have their share, instead of one half or one quarter being set aside for the rich, there ought to be about five per cent. in those parish churches. And then we are told everybody is to be classified according to

his degree. Well, it is very difficult in this democratic country of England to classify us exactly. Of course I know how to classify my lord bishop, and my Lord Nelson, because he is an earl, and my Lord Wharnccliffe, because he is another earl; but the common people like myself, how are we to be classified? What is our proper position or dignity? Is the churchwarden of the parish to get out the rate book and ascertain from the schedule of ratepayers whether one man is in a house of £200 a-year, another of £50, another of £20? That would not give you an ample criterion, because a careful man would do with less accommodation, and might not have such a large family. His grandfather or great grandfather may have been a peer too, and that would add a something to his social position. There is really no practical difficulty in the "first come first served" system. You have it in the House of Lords; you have it in the House of Commons. No doubt people frequenting the same church find themselves in the same places, and the poor in this country are the last people to thrust themselves—to push themselves. The man in the fustian coat is far too modest. He shrinks from the presence of those whom people call his betters; but there are no such thing as betters in the house of God. I am surprised to hear, from a clergyman, too, objections to the offertory—of all law-breakers in this country, there are none equal to the clergy, including even archbishops and bishops—they ought to have prayers twice every day, but they break the law wilfully and systematically—but I complain that my friend behind me advocates these breaches of the law, and talks about the wrongfulness of the offertory. Why, according to the Prayer Book, the offertory ought to be had every Sunday, and though we all of us break the law, it remains for clergymen to get up in this place and actually advocate—and that before a mixed assembly of laymen—breaches of the law. Well, I hope to hear no more of this or any other instance of these unblushing and profligate breaches of the law. But you know, after all, this is more than a question of convenience. It is a question of the proper mode of worshipping our Maker. We go to church on an equality as Christians, as baptised members, as brothers of Christ, as children of God, and as inheritors of the kingdom of heaven. That is the broad stand-point we ought to take. We go there in our character as Christians, not as fathers or brothers, or sons or daughters, but to worship our common Maker in common prayer. And the whole of our reformed liturgy is built upon this theory. They are our churches, our parish churches, and it is only that this scandalous misappropriation was sanctioned in the past by bishops, who granted faculty pews, and by modern church building associations—by common law the parish churches of England are all free and all unappropriated—it is neither more nor less than robbery that in parish churches a portion of the church has been appropriated, whether by the act of the bishop or otherwise. Faculty pews are a rank robbery which have been sanctioned by bishops in former days. It is all very well for honourable members to hiss and say "oh, oh." It is only because the bishops had the power in former days of alienating a portion of the parish property. I have heard it said at Bradford that the only reason the bishops had done this was because they knew how hard it was for the rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven, and therefore they thought they would give him every chance. It is easier for a camel, you know, to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven. For the poor it is comparatively easy, and therefore they said, "Let us put the rich man in the rightful place of the poor. We will do what we can for him, and we will give him his pew." That is all wrong, and I hope to live to see the day—I do not like to use strong words in the presence of the people here—but I was going to say when this abominable appropriation will be removed. Mind you, I don't want them all swept away against the wish of the congregation, but I want the congregation to be taught by the clergy, because this is their bounden duty. The clergy are

bound to set before the congregations the higher life, and when they have instructed us laity, I hope they will have us all at their back to get rid of any appropriation in the house of God.

The CHAIRMAN.

AFTER this attack upon bishops, under which I quail, I do not think we can do better than hear a bishop, so I call upon Bishop Perry.

Bishop PERRY, formerly of Melbourne.

I HAVE attended every Congress which has been held since I returned to England in 1874, and have heard many interesting debates; but I do not think I have ever heard one better argued than the present. I listened with great interest to the paper read by my kind host, Mr. Wake, and was thankful to hear him speak in the manner that he did of the Church of England, and of the obligations which rested upon it. I listened also with great pleasure to the excellent paper of the Rev. William Milton, as well as to what was said by others who followed him. The speech of the gentleman who has just sat down, however, was, I think, rather declamatory than logical. It appealed to our feelings and sentiments, and so drew forth a great many exclamations of approval; but it contained little if any argument. In reference to what was said by the speaker who preceded him, he affirmed that the offertory was enjoined to be used every Sunday; and so it is. But, as is to be remembered, it belongs only to the morning, and not to the afternoon or evening service. In my late diocese of Melbourne we had offertory collections in the morning, and also collections in the evening; but the same complaint which was made to the gentleman—a true gentleman, although a working-man—who addressed you before the last speaker, was reported to me, that no one could attend the worship of God without having a plate or a bag held before him for money. With reference to the appropriation of seats, which the last speaker pronounced so decidedly to be illegal, although I attach great importance to the opinion of Mr. Wake, who is a lawyer upon that subject, and therefore may probably be wrong, I have always understood that in parish churches it is the duty of the churchwardens to allot the seats to the parishioners. Mr. Collins, in his charge of illegality, seems to have confused the allotment of seats by the churchwardens, with the appropriation of pews by the faculty of the bishop: things which are utterly different from one another. The society which has, I suppose, caused the subject to be debated this evening, has done in my opinion great good to the Church, by directing attention to the abuses connected with the appropriation of pews or sittings; but I think they are doing mischief by endeavouring to banish appropriated seats altogether. I entirely agree with what was very ably said by Mr. Lefroy upon the subject—that in some places it may be well that a church should be “free and open;” by which phrase I have always understood not that it should be open every day, but that the seats should be free and unappropriated. I would say nothing about pew-rents, the expediency of which is quite distinct from that of appropriated sittings. But I would observe that in the argument against the latter, too much stress appears to me to have been laid upon the distinction between the rich and the poor. It is, I believe, perfectly true that, as has been said, a poor man will prefer to occupy an appropriated seat himself, if he can have one, and will also willingly occupy a free seat, when another by his side is appropriated. The separation of classes in our churches is no ground for

throwing all sittings open. An important fact has been altogether lost sight of on this occasion—that our churches are parish churches, and that our people are parishioners. A clergyman of the Church of England is appointed to the cure of souls of a certain number of persons living in a certain locality; and if in towns you make the churches free and open, you at once destroy the distinction between parishioners and non-parishioners. I do not know how the advocates of free and open churches, if they recognise the fact that the Church of England system is parochial, not congregational, can reply to this objection. Another fact which seems thoroughly forgotten is, that, if a church will only seat one thousand persons, and there are two thousand parishioners who desire to attend public worship, you cannot make it contain them all. By opening the seats you may vary the congregation, but you cannot increase the number that it will accommodate. If you wish to provide for an additional thousand persons, it must be done, not by making seats free and open, but by building another church, or by enlarging the old one. The argument which was used by Mr. Lefroy is, also, to my mind, a very cogent one against the adoption of the system of free and open churches. Families, he remarked, like to sit together: and that natural love of sitting together—father, mother, and children—is not to be condemned as wrong, not to be regarded as in any degree inconsistent with a filial reverence for our common Father. It is according to an instinct which has been implanted in us by God, and is perfectly consistent with the teaching of the Scriptures. While, therefore, I do not deny that there are not places where free and open churches may be preferable, I contend that the assertion which has been made this evening, that they are obligatory upon us as Christians, and as members of the Church of England, is utterly unwarrantable.

EARL NELSON.

I AM glad that I have been asked to follow Bishop Perry, because he tried to interpret what we mean by the word "open." We mean by "free" church, free and unappropriated; we mean by "open" church, a church open every day, for the use of all the people. And one of those things that puzzled him—how to put two thousand persons into a church which only holds one thousand—is solved by the free and open church system, because when you have the strictly pewed system, you are prevented very much from interfering with the church by having services except at the ordinary times, because private property is in the seats, and people object to other people being put there: but when you have an open church, free, you can have more clergymen instead of building more churches, and a succession of services to suit all the people. Now I want to say a few words in reference to the remarks of that gentleman who read the second paper. Now that gentleman stated that the grand thing of all to act upon was Lord Blandford's Act, which says that where there are seats let, they shall be half free and half let, and that they shall be so let that there shall be no distinction betwixt them. And therefore the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have generally ruled that the church ought to be divided, as another gentleman said they ought to be divided, east and west. What happens? We know practically that when you put the free and open church system side by side with the pew system, the pew system does not pay. You can hardly show me one church where that division exists. After it has existed for a time, either all the church becomes free, or all the church becomes pew-rented. Well, now I want to say a few words in reference to the working man who addressed you from the working-man's point of view. That working-man allowed that he was a regular attendant, and that is the point. With a

regular attendant, a real member of the Church—whether he is a working-man or whether he is a nobleman—he will come to worship his God in his parish church, whatever hindrances there may be, and will not make much of them. But what we want to do is this, and especially in a place like Sheffield, with a teeming population, a great many of them estranged from the Church of their fathers, many of them I am afraid from all religious ministrations altogether, we want to remove all hindrances which prevent them, if they so desire it, from coming to the parish Church. We are not to forget that we are a national Church, a Church which is bound to try to embrace all the people; we must not forget that we are a Christian Church, and therefore that we are bound to be missionary. That gentleman to whom I have alluded, said, “if you preached the gospel to the poor, the poor would come.” I want to know how you are to preach the gospel to the poor, estranged from the church, if you have churches so pewed up that there is no place for the poor to come? I do consider that it is essential that all semblance of exclusive rights should be removed from the parish church. The actual teaching of a free and open church is a true teaching of Christianity; and the church with people's possessions and rights in it, which the pew system entails, is really antagonistic in its teaching, because it teaches selfishness instead of brotherly love, and it brings that selfishness into the house of God, where all ought to be equal. But when I say this, do not say that I am calling pew-holders necessarily selfish. The thing has grown up with time. A great deal of education is required to get people to see that the old system is wrong, and that the new system is more consistent with a national and missionary Church; and I do not forget, and I hope I never shall forget, the wise counsel that we gained from one of the American bishops who visited our country this year, and who kindly came to preach for us in St. Paul's Cathedral, on this subject. He took for his text, “Yea, the sparrow hath found an house, and the swallow a nest for herself, where she may lay her young, even thine altars. O Lord of Hosts,” and he pointed out that we must not neglect the sparrow, which is the home bird, and has come naturally into the Church,—we must not forget them and carelessly drive them away; but at the same time we must not forget those wanderers who do not go so readily into the fold, those swallows, who have a right to lay their young at the font and to come at all times round the altar of their God.

Rev. Canon SCOTT, Hull.

ONE of the most frequent arguments that has been used by the speakers this evening has been that the poor like to have appropriation, and to pay their pews-rents like other people. There is only one answer to this, and it is, I am sorry to say, a very common one,—that the poor love to copy the vices of the rich. I am quite certain that is the right answer to it. I was the other day taking service in a country church—a beautiful church—in a little village where all the inhabitants were rich and well-to-do people, and the only poor were their coachmen, their gardeners, and the wives of the coachmen and gardeners, and other servants. The church was three quarters empty, though the clergyman of it was one of the best and kindest men on the face of the earth,—a good, honest, evangelical conservative, so that they were not driven away by any extreme ritual. The churchwarden told me that the poor insisted upon having each their pews for their own families, as the rich people had. The consequence was that if every family wanted a pew to themselves, the thing was impossible, and therefore the church was empty; whereas it would have held them all if there had been no appropriation. It is sometimes said that this argument is a very good one for the town, but a very poor one, and a

very difficult one for the country. I myself was inclined, knowing very little of the country, to consider that there was some truth in this, until I attended a meeting of the Free and Open Church Association, at Leeds, a few months ago. I heard a gentleman of the West Riding, a squire and justice of the peace, make a speech in which he said he felt entirely the need of the free and open system. He said that some people would not like to change their seats; true, but that he would have given anything to have a free and open church in his own parish, because he had had to sit Sunday after Sunday near a man given to intoxication. That seemed to prove that even in country churches the free and open system should obtain as well as in the towns. Let me ask this question of those who have been defending so strongly the appropriation of seats,—why is it, when they want to draw their people into a mission or to a special service, that they put upon the bills, “all seats free?” My brother, who has a large pew-rented church, held a mission, and managed to get all the poorest people of his parish into the best pews and on the best cushions, to his great delight, and I have no doubt to theirs. But when the mission was over, the clerk, bred up in the pew-rent system from his boyhood, came with a long face to the vicar and said, “it will take us months to get rid of these people, sir.” That is the result. We open our churches, fill them for a week or so, and then people come there expecting to receive the same treatment, and there is not room for them. I never for the life of me could see why families should not sit together in free and open churches. I have a very large free and open church, and I confess I know numbers of large families, running even up to twelve in number, who always manage to sit together, without any difficulty; and I confess I think more is made of that argument than need be. I think we ought to try, to some extent at least, to lose sight in church of those earthly relationships, existing or prospective. Brothers and sisters would often behave better if they were not sitting next each other; and the same might be said of those of both sexes who were looking forward to a nearer alliance. A very strong attack was made upon the weekly offertory—I can call it nothing else than an attack, though it was made by my friend Mr. Milton—because in some instances the missionary offertories have decreased. But we do not know what the collections and offertories in these churches were before the free and open system was brought in. It happened to me to have a large pew-rented church, and the rents brought in the magnificent sum of £120 a year. Directly they were abolished the offertory began at about £300 a year, and it has risen in eight years to about £800, and that, mind you, not in a west-end parish, but in the slums of a large and dirty town, where hardly anybody in the parish keeps a servant, where the very shopkeepers go out into the suburbs to reside, and where nobody who can be truly and literally called rich ever comes to the church. I would mention that the offertory is divided as carefully among the missionary societies as it ever was in the days of pew-rents. I have been enabled, I don’t say it in any boasting way: it is a mistake, I think, to be egotistic on these occasions—but a year or two ago I sent up £70 to the S. P. G., £70 to the Additional Curates’ Society, and £70 to the Church Missionary Society; and I do not think we ought to consider that missionary things are going down when that can be done. If anybody really wants to make a church free—and I do believe there are hundreds of the clergy groaning under the incubus of rents, who would give everything they have almost to get their churches free—let me advise them earnestly to take the bull by the horns, to do as I have heard they did in the church where a mission was appointed. Send home all the private books and cushions, and hassocks, and carpets, and send a letter after them to say that they were not to come back. Then you must by the next Sunday, furnish the church with hassocks and with books, the property of the churchwarden, if you wish to keep it free for ever. I am perfectly convinced that the reason why the free and

open churches have proved sometimes after a while a failure, is because we have not taken care enough to keep them free. To make them free is one thing; to keep them free is another. To be kept free they must be fitted and supplied with all the people want, and then the people can enjoy and participate in the services.

MR. SPENCER STANHOPE, M.P.

It has been my lot to attend more than one of the meetings of this Society, but I must say that I have had an advantage to-night which I never enjoyed before, of hearing the opposite side so ably placed before the meeting as it has been by several speakers. Although this society boldly advocates one particular system, they nevertheless wish to see that all due weight should be given to those who differ from them. Now, the general question resolves itself, in my mind, into two heads, namely, those churches in which pews or appropriated seats exist simply for the convenience of those who are to occupy those seats, and not with a view of raising the necessary stipend of the minister; or, on the other hand, churches, chiefly those more recently built, in which it has been found necessary or desirable that the stipend of the minister should be raised by pew rents. Now these two cases stand on a different footing. I don't see any excuse whatever for simply appropriating seats in the parish church for the sake of appropriation. In that case, in the first place, as has been said to-night, we are acting against the law, which is, that the parish church floor should be free and open to the parishioners: and in the next place, also, I would ask any practical man—are you not excluding some one who might attend? Is there not an innate feeling in all Englishmen that they don't want to intrude themselves where they have no right? Of course there are a few obtrusive spirits who like to push themselves where they have no right, but, as a rule, whether he be rich or whether he be poor, a man does not like to go except where he feels he has a right to be. I myself have felt repeatedly in London the great evil of the appropriated system. If you wish to go to church you have to stand, may be, until some one takes compassion upon you and offers you a seat: or you have to wait a long time before you are shown into an empty seat, the owner of which is not attending public worship. That is a very invidious position; and one feels that in going to worship God one ought to be admitted, and not to be obliged either to intrude upon those who have a better right than oneself, or to stand up and wait until some one takes you in. It is far better to go to a church and feel that you have a right to take the first empty seat, and that every one there had an equal right. Now with respect to the other side of the subject, namely, churches which have appropriated seats for the purpose of paying the minister's stipend; no doubt there is a great deal of difficulty in this question; but then, is it not possible to raise that stipend in some better way? I am not going to say here whether the offertory has always been successful or not, but I think that in the Church of England we perhaps depend too much upon the bounty of our forefathers. The wealth of the church, about which so much has been said, and upon which so many attacks have been made, has arisen from the bounty of our forefathers, who wished to provide the ministrations of the church for their descendants as well as for themselves. It is incumbent upon us also to do the same. I do not say that this is not done, for it is being very satisfactorily done; but I think that in cases where these appropriated seats have become necessary in order to raise the stipend of the minister, a better means might be devised, and some other way may be forthcoming to provide that stipend. Mr. Fletcher mentioned as an argument

that it was a singular thing that when working-men themselves, in his experience, erected chapels, they built them upon the appropriated system. I do not think that argument touches the question. If we were merely a party agreeing together to use certain services, we should be perfectly free to employ any means for raising money for that place of worship which we chose to erect, which we thought best. The Church of England, however, asserts itself to be a National Church—an Established Church—and she is bound, in my opinion, to make her services free and open to all, as far as room will admit. And it is no answer for a man who comes into that church to be told, "You must wait until we find whether this seat will be occupied by the person who has appropriated it or not." I say that he has a right to sit down in the order in which he enters the church, and those only who come late should be liable to be turned away. In conclusion, I have been told that since I had the pleasure of being present at the opening of the neighbouring parish church at Rotherham, that it has been thrown open, and that since that time the congregation has increased largely, compared to what it was before it was a free and open church. I can say from my own personal experience of the town of Wakefield, that since the parish church, which has recently been restored, was made free and open, its services have been crowded, and persons have to be there twenty-five minutes before the services in order to get a seat, and although that may be somewhat inconvenient, yet it is very satisfactory.

THE REV. CANON HOARE, Tunbridge Wells.

THERE are some points on which we are thoroughly agreed. We are perfectly agreed, I imagine, every one of us, in an entire condemnation of all property pews, whether they have become property by purchase or family. There is no hesitation upon that. We are thoroughly agreed, also, that no church can be a rightly ordered church if it has not ample room for the poor as well as for the rich, that is to say, free seats as well as appropriated. We are all agreed again, I firmly believe, on a third point, that there should be no appropriation without occupation, and that if a person does not occupy an appropriated seat, by his non-occupation he ought at once to lose all right to it. We have no idea, for one moment, of supporting a system of locking up a pew and keeping it empty while the person to whom it is appropriated is absent, and other people are unprovided outside. But there are some points on which we are not agreed. We are not agreed upon the principle that all distinction is to be entirely lost sight of in the house of God. And we are not agreed in believing that the maintenance of the clergy is to be thrown upon the weekly offertory. Many people say that the weekly offertory is a divine institution; I think my friend Mr. Milton has settled that. I never yet could understand how any one could come to such a conclusion from that text so often quoted to maintain it. The words are *πῆξ, ἑαυτῷ τιθετω θησαυρίσιον* "Let him set aside by himself, treasuring up;" and how any person can quote these words as teaching that we are to carry our earnings to church, and there give them away, I never yet could understand. There are two questions which we have to consider—How to win the people; and, how to maintain the minister. In the first place, we earnestly and longingly desire to win non-churchgoers; and we all have non-churchgoers in our parishes. My own experience of non-churchgoers is this—I would not speak disrespectfully of the excellent ladies and gentlemen I see about in this hall, but—I am persuaded that, with all their charms and all their attractiveness, there is nothing that keeps non-churchgoers at a distance so much as seeing ladies and gentlemen mix up with them. I have had it said to me again and again in my parish, "I will

never come to sit with those ladies." The fact is, that the working-man is a very modest man. He has a great deal of shyness, and a great deal of highness: he is both shy and high: the two go together; and he will never, if he can help it, find himself in such a position. I firmly believe, therefore, and I speak from my own experience, that the very best way of winning the non-churchgoers is to have a good portion of the church entirely free, while the other classes of whom they feel shy are so arranged that they do not occupy the same seats. As a missionary clergyman—and I wish to be a missionary in my own parish—going out amongst non-churchgoers, I would far rather have my church cut in half, and the two classes separate, than I would have them all fused together in one body. Then, as to the maintenance of the clergy. There are many thousands of churches in this country, the clergymen of which would have to be maintained by the congregation. There are many comfortable rectors with good incomes, and they may feel no anxiety on the subject. But there are multitudes who, having no such means of supply, and I must say that I cannot endure the thought of these ministers of God's word being thrown for their maintenance upon the weekly alms of their congregations. I think it is putting God's ministry in a totally false position. And when a man has been preaching the glorious gospel of the grace of God, and proclaiming the free salvation, it is something perfectly unendurable that, as soon as he has finished his sermon, he should send forth a set of gentlemen round the church carrying the begging-box, in order that the people may contribute to his own maintenance.

MR. EDWARD HERFORD, J.P., Manchester.

THE last point scarcely comes within the terms of the question, because it is well known that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have funds which they are applying for the express purpose of endowing churches: and with regard to the offertory, the case has hardly been put in a fair way, considering that in a church like St. Martin's, Scarborough, as I happen to know, the clergyman preferred to have the offertory to pew rents, which were rather desired by the founder. The arrangement made there was that the whole of the offertory should be paid into the bank every Monday in the names of the vicar and the churchwarden, and that every quarter a cheque for one hundred guineas should be paid to the incumbent. The sum contributed by the congregation was very much beyond one hundred guineas a quarter. No doubt it may be said that missions and other objects might be endangered: but I should contend strongly against that view being taken. I agree that we are bound to provide amply for the incumbent's support; but we are not equally bound to consider the excellent persons in Zululand and elsewhere abroad. I think the question of appropriation has not been quite correctly stated. We are supposed to say, "Let us have all churches free and open; let us not keep a single church closed to the poor." But I am not aware that this position is taken up. The question is one of principle, and not whether we can at once alter the practice of a century; it is not whether all churches are to be at once and universally thrown open to all, but whether public worship *ought* to be free and unrestricted to rich and poor alike now, as it was in the apostles' time. If there are a thousand families having an equal right to attend the parish church, it is not right that the hundred pews should be appropriated to a hundred of those families, leaving nine hundred families deprived of their rights. Surely the rights of the nine hundred parishioners are not in the least degree reserved or protected by confirming those rights to the one hundred parishioners. That would be tantamount to saying that you protect the parishioners by giving the whole of their common rights to a

tenth of them. What does the churchwarden undertake for a person who applies for a pew. He does not say, "You may go to a certain place." This he might say in a free church; but the would-be pew-holder says, "You must *reserve* that seat for me." How? It can only be by keeping others out of it. Now the kept-out class are the working class in towns, and the agricultural labourers, to whom Mr. Arch has so successfully appealed. I deny that our views are revolutionary. I cannot understand the extraordinary attack made upon Mr. Wake for his paper and his doctrines expressed therein. I am a lawyer as well as he and Mr. Collins. We say that the free and open church system is legal, and that you who act in contravention of it are law breakers, and that this ought not to be allowed, at least in new churches.

REV. J. B. PEARSON, Vicar of Newark.

THE discussion we have had to-night has taken to some extent a local colour, from the circumstances of Sheffield. I am just going to direct your attention to an incident with which I became acquainted only the other day, and which occurred in that north-west frontier of India to which so much attention is directed now. I have had the pleasure of spending the last few days with a missionary from Peshawur—and it is always a good thing for us, according to the old saying, to see ourselves as others see us; I am just going to tell you what the Ameer of Cabul thinks of the pew system. When the Ameer was at Peshawur, in 1869, he was shown the fine English Church at that station, but when the chaplain of the church explained to him that the whole of the congregation was arranged in order according to the relative ranks of the different officials, he expressed his utter astonishment. "Why," he said, "I am the chief ruler of my country; but when I worship in the mosque, I take my place beside my poorest subjects, for in the house of God all men are equal." Well, now, I hope we shall not be behind the grand principle expressed by the Ameer. To me it appears that the system of appropriation which is so common in our old parish churches is far worse than the system of pew-rents. The system of pew-rents is quite intelligible if you take away the notion of a parish altogether. We do not blame a nobleman for having a private chaplain for his own chapel; then I do not think we should blame a club—for a number of pew-renters combined form a sort of club—for having their private chapel and their chaplain. But do not let that be taken for the grand parochial system of the Church of England, for the two systems are wide as the poles apart. With regard to those parishes in which the clergy are fairly supported by endowments, I do think that the parishoners have, as a body, a complete right to that parish church, and my own experience is decidedly in favour of freeing that parish church. I am not ashamed to confess that I come from that county of Nottingham of which you have heard, and I do not think that any clergyman coming from that county need hesitate to confess his own pleasure and glory in the noble church of St. Mary's, Nottingham, which is our mother church. Anyone who knows the liberal spirit of the people, and the large congregations, will accept that, I think, as a sufficient defence of Nottingham. In a comparison that has just been instituted, we only heard of the offertories for the Church Missionary Society. There is a sister society, whose figures we were not introduced to, so that there may be other details with regard to the spread of missionary work in Nottingham with which we are not at present acquainted. When I was in a small country village I tried to persuade those of the same family to sit together, for I have a preference for that arrangement; but I will tell you what my success was. I was talking to a labourer on that very point, and urging him to come to church,—suggesting how nice it would be for him to sit with his

wife; and he said, "well, you see, sir, we see a great deal of our wives in the week, and we rather like to be by ourselves on the Sunday." So I made a note of it, that there were two sides even to that question. Well, then, with regard to the danger of driving away the rich people who are able supporters of the Church. I can only say that my own experience is that they do not at first like the open system—none of us like losing our monopolies; but that the best of the rich people, those upon whom we can really depend as the friends of the Church, will at first acquiesce, and presently they will be glad they did acquiesce. Mr. Bernard Wake is not a clergyman, and therefore there is one statement of his from which I venture, as a clergyman, slightly to differ. He said there were no difficulties in the way of freeing the Church. There are enormous difficulties; and I would further say that I know very few things worth doing that are done without difficulty. This is a matter of principle, and I am very glad for one that I have been through these difficulties.

MR. H. BYRON REED, London.

I SHOULD not venture to take up the time of the Congress this evening, if it were not that I felt it my duty to rebut a somewhat serious accusation made by a reverend gentleman; and presume there are others here who share my objection. I object to be termed a "Communist." It seems to me that free churchmen are in no sense Communists, and for this simple reason,—that a Communist, as we understand the term during the reign of the Commune in Paris some years ago, is an individual who desires to make away with the property of other people. Now we free and open churchmen simply want to regain property which belongs to ourselves; we have not the least wish to obtrude into the domain of our neighbours. The reverend gentleman to whom I have referred, said, in a subsequent part of his speech, that free and open churches were good in some circumstances, but not in all. I am perfectly prepared to admit that there may be cases in which free and open churches are not desirable, and in which a system of pew-rents may be found to work better—and such is the case, I believe, in the parish church of the reverend gentleman to whom I refer. But cases such as his are very exceptional, and we have to provide—not for exceptional cases, but for poor parishes, which form the general rule. As to the division of families in free and open churches, so far as my own limited experience has gone, this is a purely sentimental grievance. In absolute practice, I am happy to say, taking part, as I do myself, in the services of a free and open church, the difficulty is never experienced. My wife and myself are always able to sit together, and any separation of families, which seems so to haunt the minds of some of our friends who have spoken, may easily be obviated by people coming in good time. Mr. Milton considered it a great mistake to make war upon such a reliable source of income as pew-rents. I venture to say, ladies and gentlemen, that this source of income is at best but a very unreliable one, for the income of a pew-rented church must depend upon the ability, or preaching power, or popularity of the preacher. Given, an able man—a pulpit orator—who can draw large congregations, and sway them by his eloquence, I grant that the pews may be taken up, as is the case with Mr. Spurgeon's Tabernacle, and other large Dissenting places of worship. But the pastor may not have the gift of bringing forth high sounding phrases; and in such a case, that man is at a disadvantage in a pewed church, and the pew-rents will fall off. I differ entirely from my friend Mr. Fletcher. He asks why is it that people who have been driven from the church as we say by the pew system, go and carry out the same system themselves in their chapels. But I am not prepared to admit

that the people who we say have been driven away, and kept away, from the church by pewdom, do go and build Dissenting meeting-houses. The supporters of these are not the very poor, nor the working classes, but the smaller class of trades-people or others with whom Dissent has become hereditary. The Church of England, ladies and gentlemen, combines the extreme rich and well-to-do classes on the one hand, and the extreme poor and working-class on the other. If we carry out the principle of Mr. Fletcher's argument, we lapse into a system of mere Congregationalism—the minister being dependent on the will of the people to whom he ministers, perhaps not suffered to preach the truths delivered to him, but rather compelled to preach smooth things to please the men of the money-bags, in order to gain a competency for himself. We have witnessed in our day a great revival in all branches of the Church, and the winning back of the church's hold upon the masses of the people. Together with this we have seen the revival of the free and open system in our churches; may that system prosper, and continue to the end.

The Bishop of DUNEDIN.

It is a great pleasure to one who has been some years away from his native country to have the opportunity of listening to a debate so well sustained as this has been to-night. Canon Hoare, however, speaking upon the offertory, seemed to import a good deal of sentiment into the question by saying how very hard it was for a clergyman to be paid from the offertory. I could not help going back in my mind to very primitive times indeed in the history of Christianity, when, it seems to me, the ministers were supported by something very like the offertory. And I wish further to say that if clergymen be supported by seat-rents instead of by the offertory, I do not think that they get out of the sentimental objections that were alluded to. For some years past I have been the neighbour, in an ecclesiastical sense, of the right reverend prelate who has just left the room—Bishop Perry. We were usually separated by about 1200 miles; and I could wish that on occupying the same platform we were of the same opinion. He reminded us that the churches in this country were the churches of parishes, and that the parochial system was intended to embrace a certain area, for the benefit of which that church was erected. His argument appeared to be in effect that you could not prevent persons from other areas, or other churches or parishes, coming into particular parish churches, unless you had the seats in the latter appropriated. Well, of course we cannot, as has been already pointed out, legislate for exceptional and particular cases, and it is true that people will come over the borders when they feel so disposed occasionally. But what I want to point out is this—that if, in order to prevent some person going out of his own parish, you were to assign and appropriate the seats to particular individuals in another parish, you exclude the parishioners from the church to which they belong, in order to shut out individuals from a church to which they do not belong. My great object in rising before you to-night was to wish God speed to all operations for freeing and setting open the churches of this land, because in the Colonies it is felt that it is highly important to start that Church of Christ on the truest principles; and I have never lost an opportunity, since I had to address a Synod, of pointing out the danger we must run if we exclude the masses from the churches in those new countries which desire so affectionately to follow the customs of the mother country. My arguments are met with the retort that it will be time enough to do away with pews and pew-rents when these things are no longer used in the old country. This is my reason for most heartily wishing success to the promoters of the free and open church movement.

The CHAIRMAN.

I HAVE now one dozen gentlemen ready to speak. I have only time, however, for one more, and I hope you will think I exercise a wise selection in calling upon the Dean of Manchester.

The DEAN OF MANCHESTER.

MY name has been identified with this movement for some years now, especially in the northern counties, and I was in hopes that the Bishop of Carlisle would have kindly let me off. I am for free and open churches, distinctly. "Free," I understand; and "open," I understand. I understand the free church to be one which is, generally speaking, a church that welcomes every person who may go into it. By open churches I understand that they shall be open at all times. Our churches should be open every day for persons who seek a quiet place in which to say their prayers to God. I have known instances of many young men employed in warehouses in the city of London, who never had a moment's quiet at home, and were grateful if they found a quiet place in which to kneel down and say their prayers. I think, however, there is a fallacy latent in the word "unappropriated." The old rule in country parishes, I believe, is that the churchwardens assign a seat to any one who comes into church; that seat for the service, at any rate, is "appropriated," for you cannot put two persons in the same place. Why, then, should it be wrong if a churchwarden says to a person who goes regularly, "If you come in time I will always secure that that seat shall be yours." I do not see any harm in that, or that that goes against the principle of a free and open church. The word "appropriated," I think, really meant, as originally used, the assigning of a seat in perpetuity to a family or an estate; this, I think, is perfectly illegal. I have taken a great deal of pains to ascertain from ecclesiastical lawyers in different dioceses, whether they think this can be maintained or not, and they all say that it is contrary to the ecclesiastical law of the country, but that it may have acquired a sanction by usage and, by having been recognised by the Ecclesiastical Courts, with the consent of the bishop, its validity would probably be maintained if an attempt were made to eject an occupant claiming under such sanction. Now, I consider it to be contrary to the idea of a parish church, that any one should claim as his property a portion of the area of the church. Then we are told that the churchwardens are to seat people "according to their degrees." If it is the law of the land, the sooner it is altered the better. It is a most unscriptural method. Is there any "respect of persons" in God? What right have you, because you have broad acres, to say that you shall have the best places in church, and the poor man be driven to some obscure corner of the church? If the ordinary law is that the churchwardens are to seat people who come to church according to their degrees, this does not say anything about "appropriation." You should not allow any law to exist which would enable persons to carry out their private likes and dislikes. Supposing there were a Radical churchwarden and a Tory squire; he might seat the squire near the font, or in the worst seat he could find. In a small parish, where you have no great pressure, it is reasonable to say to any person, "If you are in time, you shall have that seat appropriated to you;" but the churchwarden can only do this for his yearly term of office. I believe my "free and open" friends will find fault with me for having said as much as this; but it is best to say what one really thinks is reasonable. The duties of a churchwarden are enormous enough with respect to the parishioners; they have a claim upon him; he is their elected

servant; he is said to be the bishop's officer in the parish, and represents them to the bishop. The churchwarden is bound to consult the convenience of the parishioners during his term of office; while his duties with respect to the parson I do not think at all onerous. I should very much prefer in discussions about seats in church that we should have the words "appropriated" or "unappropriated," strictly defined, in order that we may know what we are about. There is a gentleman behind me who will tell me that I do not know the literature of the subject; but I do not care about knowing the literature of the subject, so long as I see plainly what the right course is. No doubt it is the duty of the churchwarden to look after the parishioners and make them as comfortable as he can, and that is the sum of what he has to do. Pews and faculty seats are excrescences, which have grown up outside the common system. As to the legal views of these matters, I fear we have very few ecclesiastical lawyers now, remembering the decisions on great matters far above this—the judges seem to be all at loggerheads; and therefore it is not to be expected that every chancellor of a diocese should know the law perfectly. When they advise best, they tell you to go by the rule of common sense, namely, this:—We should have free and open churches; we should never allow portions of the common area of our own church to be appropriated to particular families; and every one should be able to find a place so long as there are any seats vacant.

The CHAIRMAN.

It is now my business to bring the proceedings of this evening to a close. I think that I may congratulate you upon an exceedingly interesting meeting, in which both sides have been very well fought out. Some rather hard hitting was aimed at bishops with regard to faculties. In the first place, it really is not the bishop who grants the faculty; he acts simply through his court, and it would be just the same thing to say that the Queen did a certain act which was done by the ordinary course of the law of the country, as to say that a bishop does a thing which is merely the legal act of his court. Besides that, it ought to be remembered that a great many of these faculties—almost nine-tenths of the faculties—supposed to be in favour of certain long appropriations are altogether fallacies. If you look into your faculty, you will constantly find that it has been granted to a particular man, that it has died with the man, and that no appropriation at all exists; and I have not unfrequently found a case in which a church is said to be full of appropriated sittings, and in which nevertheless there is not a single sitting legally appropriated. With regard to the general question whether sittings should be appropriated or not, I do not wish to express a decided opinion one way or the other; but I do wish to say that it is my experience as a bishop, and I believe there is not a single bishop who would not bear me out in saying, that there are churches within my own diocese where the poor people are practically prevented from hearing the gospel of Christ by a system of appropriation of pews. One other thing, with which I will conclude, is this,—Canon Scott told you a story—and he told it very well—about a church which was made free and open during a mission, and which reverted to its old condition when the mission came to an end. I should like to balance that with another story, from my diocese. There was a mission in a certain town, and there was a church in the town which was the very *beau ideal* of an appropriated pewed church. It was built some hundred or a hundred and twenty years ago; every seat was a pew, and there was not the smallest possibility of anybody getting into the church except the persons to whom the pews were supposed to belong, half of them not being parishioners at all, and practically three-fourths of the pews

being empty Sunday after Sunday. The mission came. The church was declared free and open *pro hac vice*. The church was filled. I went and preached in it myself. The people were so delighted with the altered appearance of the church, that they held a meeting the following week, and they determined with one dissentient that the seats in the church should be unappropriated for the future.

ALBERT HALL, WEDNESDAY MORNING,

OCTOBER 2nd, 1878.

The Right Hon. and Most Rev. the LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK
took the Chair at 10 A.M.

THE JUST LIMITS OF COMPREHENSIVENESS IN THE NATIONAL CHURCH.

The Right Hon. and Most Reverend the PRESIDENT.

BEFORE I call upon the first speaker to address you, I venture to urge upon the assembly the desirableness, out of mere respect for our own dignity, of hearing all the speakers without any interruption. In one of the local papers this morning, in which there is a very full and accurate account of our proceedings, it is said that one of the speakers last night was unable to continue on account of interruption, and came to an abrupt conclusion. That was not the case. That speaker came to the natural end of all speakers—the knell of the secretary made an end of him. But, at the same time, there were some utterances which might give some colour to such a report. Now hissing is not a distinctly human utterance; and as allusion has been made to the doctrines of development, it would be a great pity to furnish by hissing an argument for that doctrine. We are going to enter upon a set of subjects that greatly excite the minds of many of us; but I am sure I need not press you to accept all that the speakers from the various sides have to urge, to wait for an answer from some other speaker, and not to express that kind of approbation which a speaker cannot help accepting with a sense of pain.

PAPERS.

Hon. C. L. WOOD.

SINCE the National Church is the Church of God, sent to the nation, not some merely human compromise of parliamentary origin, as Mr. Hughes would have us believe, invented by the nation: since this claim involves of necessity the further assertion that none but those who acknowledge the authority of the Catholic Church have any right within its borders; the just limits of comprehensiveness in the national church must be decided, not by what may happen to please the fluctuations of public opinion, or even the wishes of the

crown and the Houses of Parliament, but by recourse to those principles of divine appointment which are to be sought for at the hands of the Church herself.

The principle, then, upon which we must approach the subject of comprehensiveness, in the first instance, is clear and distinct.

In regard to dogma, to that faith "which before all things it is necessary that a man should keep whole and undefiled," the National Church must be just as comprehensive as the Catholic Church herself, neither more nor less. In such matters there can be no question of a greater or a less degree of comprehension. The truth once for all delivered to the Church from the beginning, everywhere and by all taught and acknowledged, that truth the Church proposes to her children, and if they reject it they reject it at their peril.

It is necessary to insist upon this because by a strange inversion of the maxim "*in necessarüs unitas in dubiis libertas*" there is in certain quarters a tendency to look with approval upon the existence of the most diametrically opposite teaching in the matter of dogma, while insisting upon a rigid uniformity in matters of ritual.

There cannot be a more vicious principle. It is the Church's office to teach the truth. Nothing can relieve her from this responsibility. It is the reason why she exists, and in the discharge of this office "the quod semper, the quod ubique, and the quod ab omnibus," as is witnessed to by Archbishop Bramhall in speaking of the Thirty-nine Articles, is the one test by which the limits of comprehension in the National Church in regard to matters of faith can be determined.

There may be more or less difficulty, owing to the divisions of Christendom in applying this principle to errors that have arisen since the great schism of East and West. There can be none in its application to such questions as those which were raised not long ago by the invitation addressed to a Socinian to communicate at the altar of Westminster Abbey, or to the teaching of those who do not hesitate to deny the reality of the supernatural life that is derived from the Head to the members through the sacraments of the Church.

In regard to matters of discipline, such as questions of ceremonial and questions relating to the spiritual tribunals of the Church upon which every provincial or national church has great authority, the case is somewhat different, though even here, in such matters, some are of divine appointment, and are therefore immutable, and others are of such universal and immemorial use as to make it probable that they are apostolic. Among ourselves the latitude that can be allowed by the Church in respect to such questions must be largely influenced by the peculiar circumstances of her history.

In the crisis through which the Church passed in the sixteenth century, the justification of Elizabeth and those who acted with her is to be found in the acknowledged need of reform, and in the fact that the actual changes, much as Catholics may have disliked some of them, did not forfeit the claims of the Church so long bound up with the national life upon their allegiance.

On the other hand, a justification for the Roman party is to be

discovered in the fact that if the changes did not necessarily involve a rejection of Catholicism, they were carried out in many parishes and churches as if they did.

We can imagine the feelings of churchmen, then, when they saw their churches ravaged, and the holiest ordinances of religion reviled with the connivance of such bishops as many of the reforming prelates were, by referring to our own feelings when we saw Mr. Tooth driven out of his church at Hatcham; a congregation like S. Matthias', Stoke Newington, and S. Mary's, Crown street, scattered; a church like S. Raphael's, Bristol, closed, or devout laymen repelled from communion by a priest like the Reverend Mr. Jolley, S. John's, Birkenhead.

This double aspect of what took place under Elizabeth, is witnessed to on the Roman side by such writers as Mr. Simpson in his life of Edmund Campion, who points out that in many places "there was positively no change but the not unpopular substitution of the English for the Latin service;" and by such facts as the history of Archbishop Grindal, one of your grace's predecessors, whose patronage of the liberty of prophesying—that is, of the preaching of the Puritan Ranters—so exasperated the Catholics that it ultimately led to his disgrace. Facts like these explain the subsequent history of the Church of England, and determine the just limits of comprehension in regard to matters of discipline within her borders. To be just to all parties, then as now, we must distinguish between the actual changes themselves and the way in which they were carried out.

We must remember that the English and Latin services, by whatever names they may be called, are in all essentials the same, and that the difference between them was held to be only a matter of form.* We must remember that even in regard to that section of Catholics who were unwilling to use the English service, it was not till the pretensions of the Popes to depose Elizabeth and absolve her subjects from their allegiance, had made the use of the Latin service almost synonymous with political treason, that the mass in Latin was prohibited in chapels and oratories, so long as it was also said in English in the parish church.

What stereotyped differences, which might have been healed over, was the attitude of the Papacy, the political necessities of Elizabeth's position, and the recollection of the persecution under Mary. These combined to throw the government of the Church into the hands of men who had brought back from exile a determination to Puritanise the Church, as far as they could do so with safety, and to interpret the prayer book, not by the traditional observances of the church, but by the models they had been brought into contact with at Geneva.

It is true that they were never strong enough to obtain an alteration in the Church's rules and formularies, witness the retention of the ornaments' rubrics; but they were strong enough, then as now,

* "The Holy Communion, or Supper of the Lord, commonly called the Mass."—First Reformed Prayer Book of Edward VI.

to neglect them with impunity, and in the paralysis of the Church's life which ensued, what with the divisions and disgust of Catholics, the lawlessness of the Puritans and the subsequent desolation brought about by their means, Catholic tradition and practice all but died away. The result was that when it pleased God again to breathe upon the dry bones, and Catholics—roused from that lowest depth of degradation reached by the Church in the last century after the expulsion of the non-jurors, when its convocations were suppressed, and all belief in the supernatural character of the Church and the sacraments seemed to have disappeared—began again to assert their rights and to claim their inheritance, they found themselves looked upon as aliens and interlopers in the house that was their own. Assuredly we do not claim the restoration of those rights everywhere and at once without respect to time and place. Catholics have been forgetful of their own duties far too long to give them the right to make any such claim. But what we do claim, and what we have a right to expect, when the Church's rules and ritual have been revived with the good will of all concerned, is to be left in peace ourselves. With the formularies of the Church in our hands, in the face of the repeated declarations of the civil power, "That no new faith, no new religion was set up in England, that the crown claimed no superiority to change any ancient ceremony of the church from before received and observed by the Catholic and Apostolic Church."* I for one entirely decline to discuss the just limits of comprehension: as if there was any need of asking for toleration for ourselves. Catholic ceremonial and the freedom of the Church from the interference of the Privy Council are our rights, and the world will one day acknowledge them—but I do ask on what principles of natural justice those who can tolerate the working of the Divorce Act, who can witness without protest the blessing of the Church being given to the marriage of a Christian and a Jew, who decline to condemn if they do not encourage the schism of a person like Bishop Beccles, who openly refuse to hear confession and to give absolution, and who in a thousand ways disregard the plainest injunctions of the prayer book, can justify such license on one side, with the prosecution on the other of clergy whose only crime is that they wear the vestments admittedly covered by the words of a rubric, the force of which can only be got rid of by reading into it the words of another document, itself of the most questionable authority, and which cannot be produced.

Justice requires that the scales should be held with an even hand; but I fail to see the even-handedness of such proceedings, or with what regard to justice it can be right that a single parishioner, as in the case of S. Alban's, Holborn, who before the church was built declared he never would enter it, should have the power to persecute an entire congregation in a place where, beside himself, not a single person can be found to move against the priest they love so well.

But it will be said, perhaps, that a large portion of the nation is

* A Declaration of the Queen, ordered to be read in churches, A.D. 1569.

outside the Church; that within the Church there are so many whose sympathies lie in a Protestant direction, that if the Church is to retain her present position, it would be expedient, even at the expense of strict justice, to lighten the ship by the sacrifice of a few ecclesiastical Jonahs—the line of argument is by no means a new one. The fear “lest the Romans take away our place and our nation,” whatever form it takes, is always prompting men to unworthy actions, which, in the end, are apt to produce the results they were intended to stave off; but in this case expediency is clearly on the same side as justice. And I ask, will it tend to the maintenance of the relations between Church and State, that the worst features of the reign of Elizabeth should be revived, without their political excuse, and priests and congregations be exposed to the mercy of paid informers, in order to deprive them of observances intimately connected with doctrines dearer to them than their lives.

Consider the history of the last ten years. Is it encouraging for such an undertaking?

Has the introduction and working of the Public Worship Regulation Act hitherto strengthened the relations of Church and State? or has it not—witness the words that dropped from Lord Hartington, last year in Scotland—only widened the crack already visible in the wall?

Absolute identity of doctrine and discipline does not in Scotland prevent the Free Kirk and the United Presbyterians from desiring and endeavouring to compass the downfall of the Scotch establishment. Is it more likely to do so in England, even if you could obliterate all external distinctions between the Church and Dissent.

But there is another class of considerations, which in the interests of peace I should like to press upon the Congress.

That restoration of the Church's doctrine and practice, the growth of the last fifty years, which, on the admission of papers like the *Pall Mall Gazette* has completely altered the Church's position in the estimation of the country, is now in process of reversing the state of things the Church had to encounter at the last great crisis in her history.

Then the strength of the Church lay in the country. London was the head quarters of Puritanism; to-day the real strength of the Church is in the towns. Then it was the middle class, which was chiefly infected with Protestantism; to-day it is in the middle class that the Catholic revival is making its most numerous recruits. Then it was chiefly the young who were the strength of the Puritan party; to-day amid the mass of infidelity and indifference which surrounds us, I will venture to say that in nine cases out of ten, if a young man is in earnest, he is to be found on the Catholic rather than on the Protestant side. What do such facts mean except that the future is ours, and that those who are responsible for the present attempts at repression are conscious, if I may adapt Lord Beaconsfield's words, that they cannot “afford to wait.” What is wanted on the part of our rulers is the wisdom to see in what way the world is moving, and the tact to accommodate the course of the

great religious revival going on in our midst so as to minimize the friction inseparable from times of progress.

Such times are critical—and a mistake may set a ball rolling which nothing afterwards can stop—you may insist as far as in you lies upon a rigid uniformity in obedience to a tribunal, men are prepared to make any sacrifice rather than acknowledge:—you may render penal the expression of all outward symbols which give expression to our community in doctrine and practice, with the great founders and Saints of the Church in England, and to accomplish this, you may consider, as the Lord Chief Justice has recently said, “that there is no occasion to be over nice in dealing with these troublesome Ritualists.” You may over-ride the plain directions of the Prayer Book: you may adopt the opposite of the maxim, “*in dubiis libertas in omnibus caritas*,—for where has been the liberty which it has been sought to concede in matters which the Privy Council admits to be doubtful, and where is the charity of prosecutions that have worried one priest, illegally as it has turned out—I mean Mr. Purchas—into his grave, which has illegally imprisoned another, and equally illegally suspended a third and fourth? And you will not put down Ritualism; on the contrary its roots as has been recently pointed out by *the Times* will take a deeper hold if exposed to such persecution; but you will have created in some minds a feeling of soreness and hostility in respect to institutions in which such things are possible, and in others of indifference whether they stand or fall, which will paralyse the defences of the Church against the attacks of those who are already counting up her spoils, and make, what if we had peace among ourselves might yet be averted, disestablishment and disendowment certain. On the other hand, frankly admit that the ritual of the Church of England, limited only by what was forbidden in the second year of Edward VI., is still our rightful possession—not that it should be forced upon unwilling congregations, but that it should not be taken from us, and I will venture to say that much will have been done to solve existing difficulties.

Under existing circumstances there is much to be said for allowing a very considerable latitude to congregations. Admit this fact, by a frank recognition of the principle adopted by the late Bishop of Lichfield, and sanctioned by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the case of Mr. Bodington, and I will venture to say, with a little good will on both sides which certainly would not be wanting on ours, peace might be restored.

One thing more: if Lord Bacon, in the interests of comprehension, could, in his day, urge the folly of enforcing the oath of supremacy upon those whose consciences were troubled at the prerogatives it might seem to attribute to the Sovereign in spirituals; what would he say, were he alive to-day, in the interests of the just limits of comprehensiveness of the National Church, to the persecution of those who only ask to be allowed to obey the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, free from the unconstitutional interference of the Judicial Committee and of courts subject to its jurisdiction?

We cannot, I will add we dare not, surrender the ritual and

ceremonial of the Church, which experience has shown to be so necessary a bulwark of the Faith where it has been restored with the good will of all concerned, at the bidding of tribunals whose existence, so far as they touch spiritual matters, is an insult to all Catholic principles—or in deference, I will not shrink from saying it here, even to episcopal authority, placing itself avowedly at the disposal of the civil power.

In conclusion, I would fain express a hope that the recent decision of the Lord Chief Justice, damaging, as it must be, whatever the result of the appeal now pending, to the character and procedure of the Privy Council, may teach even the most unwilling, before it is too late, the danger of trying to govern the Church by unconstitutional means; and in the interests of the just limits of comprehension, how all-important it is to realise that a great historical Church like the Church of England can never consent, in the interests of popular Protestantism, to be treated like a department of the Civil Service, or to surrender, even in externals, the common use and practice of the Catholic Church.

REV. J. LLEWELYN DAVIES.

I HOPE it will not appear disrespectful to the Congress if, after having accepted from the Committee the honour of addressing you on this subject, I begin by expressing the conviction that it is not spiritually wholesome, any more than ecclesiastically expedient, to busy ourselves needlessly in defining the limits of orthodoxy. I mean not so much that the limits ought not to be narrow as that we should do best if we could get on without discussing limits at all. I am obliged to admit that the consideration of the limits of allowable opinion or ritual may be forced upon the rulers of the Church, and even upon the general body of its members. But it may, nevertheless, be true—and, if true, it is an important truth—that the occupation of settling the lines on this side of which a man is orthodox, and on that side of which he is heterodox, is uncongenial to the true temper and attitude of Christian faith. The Church of England, it is very well known, has not been rigorous or precise in defining the limits of its comprehensiveness. That great differences, both of theological belief and of practice in worship, are tolerated amongst us by the law has been proved by experiment, and is notorious as a matter of fact; and by the constitution of our Church no power is given to bishops or to synods to exact a conformity within that which the law of the land, interpreted by public judicial tribunals, can be made to enforce. But there are many persons whom this acknowledged laxity of the Church in drawing lines of inclusion and exclusion makes at least a little uneasy. They can scarcely deny that there are practical advantages in it, but they have a feeling that these advantages are purchased by the sacrifice of a certain ideal faithfulness in the Church. They may deem it right to make the best of the Sparta they have inherited, the great historic com-

munion into which they were baptized ; but the church of their aspirations would be one prepared to pronounce with authority upon every question which may call for solution, and rigorous to insist upon the acceptance of all its definitions. They wince under the taunts of those who can boast of their defining Pope or Assembly. Apart from the wide-spread delusion that the Church needs nothing but a duly-developed organisation to declare with satisfying completeness on all points what its members ought to believe and what they ought to deny, the idea of a Church fixing its creed in thorough unmistakable language, and binding its members to a close conformity, is one which commends itself to many minds as higher and more in accordance with the claims of truth than that of a Church which seems not to know its own boundary line. Let me protest, in opposition to this view, that the kingdom of God and of the Son of man, being spiritual, cannot be reduced under the art or practice of human surveyors ; that these verbal limits, rounding off spiritual facts, are comparatively things of the surface, things of expediency and discipline ; that the great objects of faith, such as the nature of God and his dealings with man, firm as they are at the core, have no sharpness of outline. Think earnestly of God, and you will feel no impulse to define him.

I must not enlarge upon this principle ; but I will ask you to look for a moment at the New Testament age, and see what sort of precedents, in respect of exclusion and comprehension, have the sanction of the highest Christian authority. In the First Epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul is dealing with the internal condition of a Church under his absolute control, and we observe in his administration both a strictness and a laxity : a jealous moral strictness which forbade the believers to keep company with a fornicator or covetous man or idolater, or railer or drunkard or extortioner, combined with a doctrinal and ritual laxity which argued with Christians who said that there was no resurrection, and expostulated with those who behaved with a vulgar irreverence at the Lord's Supper, and forbore even to hint at the exclusion of either class from the communion of the faithful. Instead, therefore, of being a reproach, it may be a high spiritual credit to the Church of England that it is not ready at defining limits and enforcing conformity under penalties. Rigidity is not a sign of life ; and it is rigidity, not effective spiritual force, which is shown in dogmatic and ritual precision. In the spiritual world the true endeavour of a faithful Church is to be growing in the knowledge of Christ and of God, not counting itself to have apprehended, but hoping that, to those who forget the things behind, and reach forth unto the things before, God will reveal what they seek.

It has been thought desirable, however, that we should consider at this meeting the just limits of comprehensiveness in the National Church. It is implied, I presume, in these terms, that the national character which it is our happiness still to retain makes it reasonable that our Church should be comprehensive. And no doubt this assumption is one reason for the prejudice against the connexion of the Church with the State, which is growing amongst those who

crave stricter definition and more rigorous enforcement of orthodoxy. I have pointed out that the law of its spiritual life and its obligation to follow in the steps of the Apostles ought to be more constraining than any State influence in making the Church comprehensive. It is true, however, that our nationality is at this moment an important safeguard of this high spiritual quality in the Church of England. If we were given over to ecclesiastical government, it is hardly to be hoped that devotion to spiritual truth would be as effectual in shielding liberty of thought and practice as the instincts of citizenship and social rights now are. But the question, I have admitted, may be forced upon us in our National Church, Ought such and such opinions to be tolerated, ought such and such modes of worship to be allowed, within the enclosure of the Church? How far is a clergyman to be suffered to go in the direction of Romanism, of rationalism, of non-episcopalian varieties of sect-religion, without finding himself warned that he can no longer be acknowledged as a minister of the Church of England? Questions like these may demand the reluctant attention of the Christian public as well as of the rulers of the Church.

In dealing with them, it is of primary importance, I believe, to make a clear distinction between forms of public worship and the opinions of individuals. The arguments against attempting to coerce opinion and to regulate the expression of it are obviously and overwhelmingly strong. To prescribe to a man, "You must preach this, you must not preach or publish that," to impose upon a recalcitrant teacher the limits of what he may say, for example, about the Real Presence or about the nature of Christ, is what everyone can see and feel to be dangerous to sincerity, difficult to carry into effect, and liable to the reproach of hindering the progress of knowledge. The law and its penalties are awkwardly out of place in the region of thought and speculation. But there is no such incompatibility between legal regulation and external forms. The rules of the military and naval services prescribe an infinity of observances, some of them almost ludicrously paltry to be the subjects of formal prescription, about which it would no doubt be possible for an ingenious troubler of authorities to raise controversies; but such things, it is understood, have to be settled somehow, when people are to act together and order is to be maintained. Similarly, it is in accordance with reason and the nature of things that the forms of worship in a communion should be regulated, down even to minute details, by the public authority of the communion. To say, "How inconsistent, how futile, to take action for restraining variations in ritual, whilst you let the preaching alone!" is to forget the fundamental distinction in this respect between opinion and external forms.

There is a further distinction which ought to be borne in mind. A sermon or a publication is the utterance of an individual, the better if it come warm from his mind and soul. Forms of worship are the heritage and property of the community. They are associated by the subtlest ties with the devotional feelings and dearest interests of a number of persons for whose use and benefit they have come into existence, and the public enjoyment of them is a sacred right which

authority is bound to guard. When a clergyman introduces arbitrary changes in the customary ritual of a Church, he confuses *meum* and *tuum*. To say what he himself believes is the preacher's duty ; but the forms of worship belong to the people, not to the priest who may come to minister amongst them.

The enforcement of conformity in matters of ritual belongs to the province of judicious and equitable administration. An extreme diversity calls for restriction, not so much because it is so far from the safe middle, or so divergent from the rubric, as because it is a violent invasion of the spiritual rights of the Church community. The fact that variations in ritual are associated with variations in doctrine is an additional reason why those rights of the community should be protected. A worshipper is bound to accept the acknowledged ritual of his Church ; but he may have a just ground of complaint if a special doctrinal character is thrust without his consent upon his devotions. Changes in modes of worship, however desirable they may be, are bound to win their way by attraction and conciliation.

It seems to me, then, that a kind of coercion may be legitimate and expedient in setting limits to divergences of ritual, the circumstances of each case being taken into due account, which it would be supremely unwise to attempt to apply to teaching. I have briefly referred to the obvious arguments against the coercive regulation of what is to be preached or written. If we were to listen to those arguments only, they might induce us to dispense with all standards of doctrine, and even with all creeds, and to give absolute liberty of teaching to the ministers of the Church. If we stop short of those conclusions, it is not because we discover any weakness in the arguments, but because we also see how essential the bond of a common faith is, not only to the well-being, but to the very being, of a Church, and because positive statements of belief have proved themselves to exercise so important an influence on the permanent life of the Christian body. I am far from denying that it may be incumbent on the Church to remove a man from the office of teacher, and from the sacred ministry, on account of his declared opinions. If a minister of the Church were to affirm the infallibility of the Pope, and to teach that the Virgin Mary ought to receive the worship now given her in the Church of Rome, or to declare that the Lord Jesus Christ was a mere man, with no divinity but such as belongs to other men, or to denounce the use of Baptism and the Lord's Supper as a superstition, I do not see how the Church could decline to say to him through the proper organs, "You are no longer in your place in the pulpit and at the altar of the Church of England." Officers of the Church ought not to be free to proclaim open war against its creed or its institutions. But, according to the principles which I am now advocating, such an act of discipline ought to be regarded as a melancholy necessity—the less of two evils—not as a noble or fruitful effort of service to Christ. In doubtful cases, the rulers of the Church ought, with the clearest conscience as servants of Christ, to lean to the side of laxity. There is almost a certainty of harm being done by excision and repression, no security at all of any good

being done. Nothing could be more unspiritual, nothing more injurious to the Church as a society called to a living fellowship with God through Christ, than a crusade against heterodoxy. It ought to be deprecated far less in the interest of those who might be expelled than in that of those who would remain.

It was perhaps intended in the choice of readers for this meeting that each of the schools which are supposed to be straining the loose bond of English Churchmanship in three different directions should have an opportunity of saying what it has to say for itself. I might have argued that, whatever restraints it may be thought needful to impose on the excesses of Ritualists at one corner of the triangle, or of Dissenting-minded Evangelicals at another corner, the cord ought to be made indefinitely elastic for liberal churchmen, on the ground that they form the school which is the most in harmony with the growing knowledge of the time and the ruling spirit of the lay world. That is in truth a consideration not to be lightly esteemed by sensible men. It is neither an easy nor an unimportant burden, I will ask you to believe, that is borne on behalf of their brethren in the Church of Christ by those who are striving to bring the great ideas of the modern age, such as those of evolution and democratic equality, into their right relations with the Gospel of the Father revealed in the Son, and who are firmly resolved that, the God of light helping them, no devotion to a sacred cause shall impair their loyalty to living truth. But toleration does not seem to me to stand in need of any earnest advocacy. The freedom of parties can take care of itself. It is one happy result of "our unhappy divisions" that we keep one another tolerant. Let those cry out who think they have to complain of persecution. My feeling is rather that it is a time of extraordinary indulgence, and that all parties have reason to be grateful for the considerate treatment they receive in the Church at large.

I would rather use my brief opportunity to urge upon my brother Churchmen that we should not let ourselves be troubled by the problem of limits, nor think that any deadly harm is done by those who may overstep the line of reasonable conformity in one direction or another, but should concern ourselves about the real apprehension of eternal things as distinguished from the precise stating of them in verbal propositions. It is certain that we might have absolute unruffled orthodoxy in conjunction with an utter absence of belief. It is conceivable that every whisper of dissent might be silenced, whilst God, and Christ, and redemption, and spiritual happiness became nothing but empty names to the whole conforming society. On the other hand, what would abounding divergences signify, if the faith of Christians in things above were gaining strength, if the Church as a whole were enabled to discern more surely the righteous and loving God ruling from the eternal throne, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God? To increase this faith, the only faith of any value, we need to be helping one another almost as those who grope in the dark, making the best of hints from every quarter, trying together to keep our faces steadily towards the light. Much of our reverent study should be given to the new

forms of knowledge and of life which the Divine Hand is developing in our days with an unparalleled swiftness, and of which the issue must be, neither to displace Christianity nor yet to leave it as it was, but to raise it into new greatness and splendour. In the conflict of such light as we enjoy, and such darkness as sometimes seems to be thickening round us, we have nobler interests, higher duties, than those of clipping the wings of thought or putting opinion on the rack.

REV. CANON RYLE.

I SHALL not weary the Congress with common-places about the difficulties of this subject. But I may say that my own personal difficulty arises from a feeling that I cannot handle it without displeasing some of my hearers. However, we are invited and expected here to speak our minds without reserve, and to keep nothing back. If, therefore, in treating this subject from the stand-point of a decidedly Evangelical clergyman, I say things which some of you may dislike, I appeal to that courtesy and good nature which I have always met with on Congress platforms, and ask you to hear me patiently.

There are two phrases in the theme before us which stand out prominently on its surface. One of the two is "the comprehensiveness of the National Church;" the other is "the just limits of the Church's comprehensiveness." On each of these I have something to say, and I shall take the larger phrase first.

(1.) To be *as comprehensive as possible*, consistently with reverence for Scripture, should be the aim of every well-constituted national Church. Reason and common sense alike point this out. It should allow large liberty of thought within certain limits. Its "necessaria" should be few and well-defined. Its "non-necessaria" should be very many. It should make generous allowance for the infinite variety of men's minds, the curious sensitiveness of scrupulous consciences, and the enormous difficulty of clothing thoughts in language which will not admit of more than one meaning. Above all, the heads of a national Church should never forget that it is a body of which the members, from the highest minister down to the humblest layman, are all fallen and corrupt creatures, and that their mental errors, as well as their moral delinquencies, demand very tender dealing. The great Master of all Churches was one who would not "break a bruised reed or quench smoking flax," and tolerated much ignorance and many mistakes in his disciples. A national Church must never be ashamed to walk in his steps. To secure the greatest happiness and wealth of the greatest number in the State is the aim of every wise politician. To comprehend and take in, by a well-devised system of scriptural Christianity, the greatest number of Christians in the nation, ought to be the aim of every national Church.

Now comprehensiveness, such as I have described, I believe to be a peculiar characteristic of the national Church of England.

do not admit the truth of Chatham's famous dictum, that we have Calvinistic articles, a Popish liturgy, and Arminian clergy. It sounds smart, but it is not correct. But I do believe that there is no Church on earth which contains so large a number of educated, intelligent, independent, thoughtful, free-speaking ministers and laymen, who, while they differ widely on some points, and each thinks himself right and others wrong, are all firmly attached to their own communion, and would be ready, if need be, to fight for it to the very last. We all probably think we could reform and amend the Church a little, and each school has its own nostrums and medicines, which it believes would improve the Church's health, if taken. And, like genuine Englishmen, we are all ready to grumble because we cannot have everything our own way. Yet there is a curious amount of agreement among us about certain great principles. We all love our old English Bible, if we do not always interpret it alike. We like Episcopacy, if we do not equally like all our bishops. We like the prayer-book, if we do not put the same sense on all its phrases. We like our parochial system and our parish churches. We like our Articles, and Creeds, and mode of worship. And if any man asks how much we like these things, I advise him to try to take them away. He would soon find that he might as well try to interfere between husband and wife in a family quarrel, and that all parties would agree in telling him to mind his own business, and in shutting the door in his face.

The plain truth is, that our national Church is very like our national army, which contains several various forces, each firmly convinced of its own peculiar importance. In time of peace the guards chaff the line and the line the guards, the cavalry makes light of the artillery and the artillery of the cavalry, the kilted Highlanders think little of the Rifle Brigade or the Welsh fusiliers, and the Irish regiments think themselves best of all. But let the stern realities of war once begin, and a British army be sent to a foreign shore—let the campaign really commence, and the enemy be met on the field of battle—let the word be given to advance across the Alma, or charge up the valley of death at Balaclava, or storm the Redan, or force the Khyber Pass—and where will you find more real union and brotherly feeling, and readiness to stand shoulder to shoulder, than in the army of our Queen? And so I believe it is in our national Church. There may be many traitors among us, sceptics and Romanists, who are useless and untrustworthy. But for all this, there is a vast amount of substantial agreement within our pale. In spite of all her apparent differences the national Church has strong elements of cohesiveness, and contrives to satisfy and keep together a very large proportion of the people of this land. This is what I call successful comprehensiveness.

In questions like these there is nothing like coming to names and facts. From the long roll of great divines to which the national Church can thankfully point, let me select a few examples of men of different schools of thought, and then let me ask any thoughtful Churchman whether there is one of them whom he would wish to blackball and exclude from our ranks. Let us think of Ridley and

Latimer and Jewell,—of Hooker and Andrews and Pearson and Hammond,—of Davenant and Hall and Usher and Reynolds,—of Stillingfleet and Patrick and Waterland and Bull,—of Robert Nelson and George Herbert,—of Romaine and Toplady and Newton and Scott and Cecil and Simeon,—of Bishop Ryder and Bishop Blomfield,—of Archbishops Longley and Sumner and Whately,—of the martyred Bishop Patteson, and the late Canon Mozley. What reading man does not know that these men differed widely about many subjects—about the Church, the ministry, and the sacraments—about the meaning of some words and phrases in the prayer-book—about the relative place and proportion they assigned to some doctrines and verities of the faith? But they all agreed in loving the Church of England, in thanking God for her Reformation, in maintaining her protest against Rome, in using her forms of worship, and in labouring for her prosperity. They could pray and praise together. In days of darkness and persecution they drew together, like Hooper and Ridley in Queen Mary's time, and found common ground. We may all have our pets and favourites in this list. We may greatly prefer some of these men to others. We may think some of them were in error, and did not declare "all the counsel of God." But after all, is there one of them whom we would like to have turned out of our communion? I reply, not one! With all their shades of opinion they were honest Churchmen, and there was room in our pale for all. And this is what I call the practical comprehensiveness of the national Church.

(2.) But are there are no *limits to the comprehensiveness* of the Church of England? This is a very delicate question; but I am prepared to look it fully in the face. It is one of such vast importance, in a day of abounding liberalism, that it seems very desirable to lay down one or two leading principles on the subject.

There ought to be some limits to the comprehensiveness of every church for the sake of order. Once more I assert that reason and common sense point to this conclusion.

Order is heaven's first law. There was order in Eden before the fall. There will be perfect order on earth at the restitution of all things. A Christian Church utterly destitute of order does not deserve to be called a Church at all. A Church must have a creed, and certain fixed principles of doctrine and worship. Its members have a right to know what its ministers are set to teach. A Church which is a mere boneless body like a jelly-fish, a colourless, bloodless, creedless Pantheon, in which every one is right who is in earnest, and nobody is wrong, and in which it does not matter a jot what is preached and taught, so long as the preachers are sincere—such a Church is an unpractical absurdity, and the baseless fabric of a dream. The Church which abandons all "limits," and knows not what it believes or would have its members believe, may do very well for Cloudland or Utopia, but it will never do for a world where there are tears and crosses, troubles and sorrows, sickness and death.

The member of the national Church of England has a just right to expect one general type of teaching and worship, whether he goes

into a parish Church in Truro or Lincoln, in Canterbury or Carlisle. Different shades of statement in the pulpit he may find himself obliged to tolerate. But he may fairly complain if the doctrine of one diocese is as utterly unlike that of another as light and darkness, black and white, acids and alkalis, oil and water. "Liberty of prophesying" and free thought, in the abstract, are excellent things; but they must have some bounds. Just as in States the extreme of liberty becomes licentiousness and tyranny, so in Churches it becomes disorder and confusion. The Church which regards Deism, Socinianism, Romanism, and Protestantism with equal favour or equal indifference, is a mere Babel, a "city of confusion," and not the city of God.

Now I contend that the national Church of England has set up wisely-devised "limits" to its comprehensiveness. Those limits, I believe, are to be found in the Creeds, the Articles, and the Book of Common Prayer. These well-known documents, I maintain, provide limits wide enough for all reasonable men who do not object *in toto* to liturgies and Episcopacy. They are documents, no doubt, which all do not interpret alike. As long as the world stands, and as long as language is what it is, you will never get men to place precisely the same meaning on theological phrases and words. But, however variously we may interpret the Creeds, Articles, and Prayer Book, they are unmistakable limits, fences and bounds within which the national Church requires its ministers to walk, and he that flatly rejects them, denies them, contradicts them, and transgresses them, is in his wrong place inside the Church of England.

(a.) If, for example, on the one hand, a man calling himself a Churchman deliberately denies the doctrine of the Trinity, or the proper deity of Christ, or the personality of the Holy Ghost, or the atonement and mediation of Christ, or the inspiration and divine authority of Scripture, or the obligation of the two sacraments, I cannot understand what he is doing in our ranks. Of course, as an Englishman, he may come into our places of worship; but common sense seems to me to point out that he cannot conscientiously use our prayer book, and that he has certainly no right to occupy our pulpits and reading desks.

(b.) If, on the other hand, a minister of the national Church maintains and teaches those distinctive doctrines of the Church of Rome which are plainly named, defined and repudiated in the 39 Articles, and, ignoring the public declaration which he made on taking a living, deliberately teaches transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, purgatory, the necessity of auricular confession, and the invocation of saints, I contend that he is transgressing the liberty allowed by the Church of England. He may be zealous, sincere, earnest, and devout, but he is in the wrong place; he has stepped over the just limits of the Church's comprehensiveness, and is occupying an untenable and unwarrantable position.

Whether these documentary limits of our Church's comprehensiveness are the wisest and best that could have been devised, I have no time to consider to-day. At any rate they are at present the law of the land. But one assertion I will venture boldly to

make. Search all the Confessions of faith in christendom, and I defy any man to find one which combines decision and firmness in necessary things, and moderation in non-necessary, things so admirably as the Articles of the Church of England. Nor yet will you find a Church which allows such liberty and freedom of thought to its ministers. Let our rivals in other communions say what they please about our need of "liberation;" the freest pulpit on earth is the pulpit of our Established Church.

Of course the things I have just said appear very narrow and illiberal to some minds. There are many now-a-days who are so enamoured of liberty that they would throw down all theological "limits" and fences, and leave the platform of our Church as bare as a common. They tell us the only way to save the Church from shipwreck is to pitch overboard creeds and articles as useless lumber, and to assign no bounds to her comprehensiveness, so long as her ministers are "earnest and sincere." I am utterly unable to see with the eyes of these people. I believe that it is miserable policy to try to purchase unity and peace and charity at the expense of faith and hope and truth. I contend that a rejection of Deism and Socinianism on one side, and a rejection of Romanism and superstition on the other, form "just and fair limits to comprehensiveness," and that our Church does well and wisely in requiring her ministers to walk within them.*

But I go further than this. I contend that the maintenance of certain well-defined "limits to comprehensiveness" is absolutely essential to the welfare of our Church, and that without such limits it is vain to expect any blessing from God. I fail to see in ecclesiastical history a single instance of good being done to souls except by the agency of men who adhered strictly to positive doctrinal "limits," and preached and taught positive distinctive truths. Weigh and analyze the teaching of any English divine who has shook the earth, from the time of the Reformation down to the present day; tell me, if you can, of one who ever roused consciences, awoke the sleeping, and revived the dead, who did not hold and proclaim a well-defined and limited theology. Show me, if you can, a single "master of assemblies," from Latimer down to the most popular mission-preacher of this day, who ever wrought deliverance on

* "Those who, in their dread of strife and party violence, would seek to preserve union by abstaining from all mention of every doctrine that is likely to afford matter of controversy, by laying aside all formularies and confessions of faith, and by regarding with indifference all varieties of opinion among professors of Christianity; would in fact put an end to the very existence of the society itself whose integrity and concord they would preserve. In preventing hurtful contentions, by giving up everything that is worth contending about, they would be rooting out the wheat along with the tares; and for the sake of extirpating noxious weeds, would be condemning the field to perpetual sterility. And after all, it would be but an apparent union that would result, since the members of the same nominal Church could have but little sympathy with each other's sentiments and designs, when they know them to be essentially at variance with their own.—We are not then to hold a society together by renouncing the objects of it; nor to part with our faith and our hope, as a means of attaining charity."—(Archbishop Whately's Bampton Lecture—I. 44.)

earth and turned the world upside down, by a mere colourless gospel, a gospel without the Trinity, without the Atonement, without the blood of Christ, without the Holy Spirit, without justification, without regeneration. No! you will never find one: never, never! Grapes will not grow on thorns, nor figs on thistles. The Church which allows its ministers to teach a "vague earnestness and sincerity," instead of distinctive Christian doctrine, may get the reputation of being very liberal and tolerant, in these latter days, but it will never convert and satisfy souls. A church must have some "limits" and bounds to its comprehensiveness, if it desires to do good.

And now let me conclude with an earnest appeal to my brother churchmen, by way of application. For the sake of peace, for the sake of truth, for the sake of the Church of England, for the sake of Christ,—let us strive and pray that we may hold fast both the principles referred to in this subject, the principle of "comprehensiveness" and the principle of "limitation."

(a.) Let us be of a *comprehensive* spirit. Let us not exclude from the Church those whom the Church has not excluded, nor ostracise and excommunicate every one who cannot pronounce our Shibboleths, or work exactly on our lines. I am an Evangelical Churchman, and I am not a bit ashamed of it. But I have no sympathy with those who advocate a rigid cast-iron uniformity, and want all churchmen to be, like the rails round Hyde Park, of one unvarying mental height, colour, shape and thickness. If any man asks me to cast out of the Church of this day men of the type of Andrews and George Herbert,—or of Burnet and Whichcote,—or of Bishop Blomfield or Thirlwall,—or of Bishop Wilberforce or Selwyn, I tell him plainly that I will not do it. No doubt I could not preach comfortably in the pulpits of such men, nor they in mine. I could not take them as curates, nor could they take me. I prefer to support my own favourite religious Societies, and they prefer theirs. But if any one wants to thrust them out of the Church of England, because, like Apollos, they do not seem to him to know the "way of God perfectly," I will not lift a finger to help him. I will tolerate these men, on my principle of Church comprehensiveness, and in return I ask them to tolerate me.

(b.) On the other hand, let us neither be ashamed nor afraid of having *limits* to our comprehensiveness, even the limits of our mother, the Church of England. Let us not overstrain the quality of liberalism so far as to sanction theological licentiousness. Let us be as broad as the Creeds and Articles, but not one inch broader. If anyone tries to persuade me that I ought to smile and look on complacently, with folded arms, while beneficed or licensed clergymen teach Deism, Socinianism, or Romanism, I must tell him plainly that I cannot and will not do it. At this rate the apostles ought to have left the world alone, eighteen centuries ago, and were fools to assail heathenism and live and die preaching Christ crucified. At this rate the English Reformation was a huge schism and mistake, and Ridley and Latimer ought never to have resisted Rome and gone to the stake. No! I love my own Church too well to

tolerate either scepticism on the one hand or Romanism on the other, and I think I am only doing my duty to my ordination vows in trying to "drive both away."

But after all it matters little what we clergymen may think or do. The question before us is rapidly getting out of clerical hands. There are handwritings on the walls, which it needs no Daniel to interpret. I think I know something of the laity, and especially in the middle classes, in this country, and I am certain they will never tolerate and support a national Church which either desires to return to Rome, or has no theological "limits," and holds no distinctive doctrines. They do not desire a narrow, party-spirited, and exclusive Church; but in a weary, working, sorrowful world, the laity will not put up with a religion either of negations or superstitions. They want bread, and they will not be content with stones. Once let the English laity see that a reign of complete latitudinarianism has begun, that the old landmarks are thrown down, and that the national Church does not care a jot whether her ministers preach Deism or Bible Christianity—Protestantism or Popery—but gives equal favour to all—once I say, let the laity see this, and they will desert the national Church and leave it to perish. Give the laity the old paths of the Bible, and the well-defined limits of the Articles and Creeds, and they will stand by her to the last. Destroy those limits, or refuse to enforce and maintain them, and they will soon cry "let us depart hence." Our candlestick will be removed, and the Church will die for want of churchmen. In short there is no alternative. The question is one of life or death. The English national Church must either be Protestant and have distinct doctrinal "limits," or cease to exist.

ADDRESSES.

The Venerable ARCHDEACON OF MIDDLESEX.

MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,—If I understand the terms of my subject aright, I am in no sense called upon by it to examine what limits of comprehensiveness might be advantageously laid down, let us say, by civil governors, who would determine what inclusive formula or symbol of belief they shall adopt, and by aid of it construct a national religious institution. This process, indeed, *valcat quantum*, can only take place, supposing a general persuasion to prevail that it is competent for civil governors to essay it, and supposing also that a horde of religionists of various denominations can be induced to submit to a *concordat*, which shall, by some compromise on the part of each, eventuate in a corporate body embracing the greatest possible number.

I have rather to consider, *First*, what tracks of religious thought exist, as ordinary or normal conditions of original and of continued membership, in the accredited documents of a certain historic corporation established amongst us, now and for ages past, as the National Church of England. *Secondly*, whether outside such tracks any, and if so, what varieties or eccentricities of religious thought are, or may be justly, allowed, without forfeiture of membership, or liability to imputation of disloyalty? Whether, this being conceded, the same degrees of variety are

allowable in clergy and laity? And, if different degrees, or indeed in any case, on what principle or principles such allowableness is to be based?

This I proceed to do, just saying first a few words as to what this National Church is, and what is its nature and origin. . Nothing appears to suit my purpose better than to quote a passage from the manifesto of the recent Pan-Anglican Conference. On this I shall found a contention that its limits, though well-defined, are, and should be, very comprehensive, and that its pressure upon the consciences of its members is and should be as elastic as possible; in fact that, while "it lives it should let live." I treat of it, then, as an organised part of that large body, "united under One Divine Head, the One Catholic and Apostolic Church, holding the One Faith revealed in Holy Writ, defined in the Creeds, and maintained in the Primitive Church—receiving the same canonical scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as containing all things necessary to salvation—teaching the same Word of God—partaking of the same divinely-ordained Sacraments, through the ministry of the same Apostolic Orders—and worshipping One God and Father through the same Lord Jesus Christ, by the same Holy and Divine Spirit, who is given to them that believe to guide them into all truth." Such an institution cannot be created by human management. Slips, indeed, of the divinely-planted parent stem may be transplanted by man's instrumentality from one land to another. It was thus when Christianity was first introduced into Britain. Grafts of it may be inserted in the slips so transplanted. It was thus when Augustine of Canterbury came to Britain. Pruning of excrescences, or of undue luxuriance in branch or leaf injurious to fruit-bearing may take place. It was thus that the Reformation had its office. But a Church must grow as ours has grown. Small, at first, perhaps, but developed by accretions and adhesions, perfected through trials, endowed by the devotion of substance on the part of its members, it at length becomes national. So has our Church become. Well, these things premised, let us come to our questions.

The ordinary or normal conditions of membership of our National Church (Baptism, of course, being pre-supposed) are, first, an acceptance of the Creeds of Christendom. Next, of what has clustered beside and around those creeds. These are, the Prayer-book (to which is attached the Ordinal) for continual reference and devotional use, and the Articles of Religion, which are, for the most part, except so far as they embody the creeds, for occasional and what may be termed defensive use. At the root of all is the acceptance of Holy Scripture as containing an inspired message from God. In strictness, then, no one can be considered to be comprehended in the National Church who does not hold the Creeds, who does not at least endure the Thirty-nine Articles, who does not worship in the language of the Prayer-book, who does not believe that Holy Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation, and take its morality as the guide of his life.

Does it follow, however, that everyone who is unable, or perhaps unready, to recognise these conditions explicitly, or to express his acceptance of them in intelligible language, is to be at once necessarily extruded from the limits of the National Church, or to be excommunicated, considered, that is, as an alien to, or an apostate from, her communion? I answer, the Church herself does not seem to think so. For, "If I did" (she may be supposed to argue), "what is to become of infants, who are physically as unable the moment after as they were the moment before their baptism, to perform the promises of faith and Christian practice which are made for them in that sacrament? What is the meaning of the education which I impart, and which brings knowledge and power to perform only by degrees? What is to be said of the countless multitudes of the poor, and indeed of all ranks, for whom, as children of larger growth, I profess to have care, but who, with all my care, can scarcely be advanced beyond the simplest rudiments of belief, or the most

elementary Christian practice? What of the many who, with yearnings after religious life and religious teaching, pause, as it were, on my very threshold, and, because they have found some relief in Nonconformity, the rivers of Abana and Pharpar, have no mind for the pure waters of Israel? What of the hereditary Nonconformists, who have frequently no reason to give for their goings, except that they are walking in the footprints of their fathers? What of the uninstructed, the invincibly ignorant, and the indifferent?" It does not seem, measuring her by her acts, at least, and by some of her declarations, and taking into account the fact that she refrains to exert a purgative discipline, that the National Church, for whatever reasons or on whatever principle, chooses to pronounce the persons coming under these categories to be beyond her limits. It would rather seem that, unless they assume an attitude of avowed hostility to her, she holds all baptised persons to be her children, some of them, indeed, erring and wayward children, but yet her children still, not beyond the reach of her prayers and loving ministrations, and so, it may be, in God's good time, to be her own in very perfectness. Persons may leave her, but the Church does not enforce their leaving. No clergyman forbears to consider even the Nonconformists whom he finds on coming to his parish, to be potentially, that is, in hope, a portion of his flock.

I would go yet further. If baptised lay persons are willing to accept the creeds, and negatively, at least, her services, though not partaking in them to the full, the Church does not, by overt act or by judicial expression, visit with penalties spiritual or temporal those who are chargeable with eccentricities, as they may be called, of doctrine. In former days, days of persecution, days of tests, it may have been held by the Church just to do so. It is not so with her now. For the laity the Thirty-nine Articles are not intended at all. Outside the limits of the creeds they are allowed an almost unfettered liberty of speculation, and even of utterance of speculation, upon religious subjects, without forfeiture of membership. No elaborate proof can be required of this. Meanwhile it is clear as a fact not merely that she has abandoned the policy of the Romish Inquisition, and that imitation of it to which the pages of Foxe give evidence, but that accusations such as that which took place recently of depraving the Prayer-book signally fail, as not in accordance with her spirit.

Thus much of the Church's treatment of the laity, and it would not be difficult to show that in this her treatment she is carrying out the forbearance which marked the Church in the earliest ages. She is also recognising the truths that free thought cannot be restrained at all, or, if restrained, is succeeded by stagnation, and even worse evils, and that the expression of free thought cannot be restrained beyond a certain point. Divisions, indeed, she holds to be unhappy; but she does not do more than pronounce them to be unhappy, when and so far as they lead to disastrous results deprecated in her prayer for unity, or destroy the oneness which is there so eloquently set forth.

But how about the clergy? It would seem that even they are, tacitly at least, permitted to speculate, and even to teach, in a manner which at first sight appears to contravene the Thirty-nine Articles and the Prayer-book, and that on matters which are not positively, or at least implicitly, laid down in either of these documents, there exists amongst them, and is not authoritatively rebuked, a very wide divergence of opinion. And it has been said, "If this be so, should it be so? The clergy cannot be regarded, though the laity may be, as simple units; they are centres of systems which may grievously impinge upon each other, and thus impair the oneness of which we have just spoken as desirable. To call a body thus split up, by the name of the Church of England, is to reduce that Church to a sort of geographical expression, just as before the Peninsula was welded into one state under the sway of Victor Emmanuel, Italy was a mere geographical expression.

That designation covered a number of diversely-governed states, with distinct boundary lines. So, the Church of England covers a multitude of religionists, greatly differing from each other." This comparison is an ingenious one, but scarcely a sound one. The Italian States were destitute of any principle of mutual cohesion. Parma, Modena, Naples, Savoy, had nothing but the name of Italy in common. It is far from being thus with the differing schools in the Church of England. Whether broad, or evangelical, or high, or what not, they are unmarked by local territory; congregations containing them respectively are scattered over the whole surface of the Church; all can meet, as to-day, on the same platform; all have that common bond which is set forth by the Hundred Bishops, amongst whom were our own, and the maintenance of which is implored in the prayer for unity. And how does the case really stand with the clergy? They positively accept the creeds, and the title of an apostolic ministry—as far as the Thirty-nine Articles go, they subscribe to them, and however diversely they may interpret them, "take them," in the words of a royal declaration, "to be for them." As far as the Prayer-book goes, they give their assent generally to it, and agree to use it; and in matters beyond these two documents, they still assert that their sentiments are at least compatible with their remaining in, and being teachers in the National Church.

Well, the Church tacitly, permits this. She has not, of late years, at any rate, extruded clergy unless, as in two comparatively recent instances, those of Mr. Voysey and of Mr. Heath, they teach in direct contradiction of the creeds, or advocate a sort of happiness hereafter which it is impossible to reconcile with the holy and pure idea of the life everlasting spoken of in the creeds. And, unless again, they decline to use the Prayer-book, or declare the Thirty-nine Articles to be opposed to Scripture or false in doctrine, or publish or preach what, after every explanation and abatement made, is found to be utterly inconsistent with those documents, or set their ordination vows and commission at naught. And I think she may be supposed to exercise this leniency, and to consider this practical comprehensiveness to be *just*, on the following principles:—

First. She finds that the ancient Church allowed considerable latitude of opinion, and that the often quoted canon "*Semper, ubique, ab omnibus*," goes a very little way beyond the creeds.

Secondly. She observes that, in the Church of Rome, compulsion produces outward conformity in the weaker, infidelity in the stronger, minds of its constituent members, while expulsion or fear of it produces the former of these evils, and exhaustion of energy as well.

Thirdly. She has learned wisdom by unhappy trial of measures of compulsion and expulsion in her own administration.

Fourthly. She knows *a priori* that, as men cannot be made to view even external objects from the same point of view, they can still less be made to regard a body of doctrine from the same point of view.

Fifthly. She has found by experience that many opinions which have seemed strange at first, bye-and-bye fall into their proper place, and are reconcilable with the truth.

Sixthly. She is eminently patient and willing to wait in order that earnest men may discover that their present views are perhaps undue exaggerations of truth, perhaps re-assertions, in a form too startling, of truths for some time forgotten, perhaps a mere reaction from indifference, perhaps a temporary misunderstanding of some isolated truth, which has been obscured by vulgar incrustations upon it, or expressions of it.

Lastly, seeing that Scripture itself is not formal, is not solicitous to harmonize every one of its statements, is very simple in the few outlines of symbols which it presents, the Church of England is anxious not to add, in perpetuity, to the divine

propositions, any stringent application of human propositions which were put together originally for a temporary purpose.

I must conclude, for my time is short, with a concise and almost epigrammatical illustration of these principles of comprehensiveness.

1. St. Augustine of Hippo made many over-statements when contending against the Manichees and the Pelagians. But he was not therefore extruded from, or rebuked by, the Church of his day.

2. One has only to converse with priests, to say nothing of the laity, in the Church of Rome, to discover that beneath her forced conformity lurks a vast amount of reticence—shall I call it?—or suppression of religious convictions, which is defended on the plea, "the Church thinks for me;" or of infidelity, which endures doctrines as necessary to keep the world in order.

Again, the expulsion of the Jansenists, and their consequent consolidation into an external and separate communion, did not extinguish Jansenist views, though they deprived the Church of Rome at the time of many good and learned men. Those views still exist largely in that Church, the holders of them exercising the discretion, called by some the economy, of avoiding the exact way of expressing them, for which Quesnel and others of the Port Royalists were censured.

3. Compulsion did not answer in the early days of the Reformation. The perhaps not formal but practical expulsion (for clamour and discouragement amount to this) of Wesley and Whitfield in the 18th century, and of others of very different schools from either of theirs, in the 19th, has proved anything but permanently beneficial.

4. 5. Question those whose preaching seems to consist of one doctrine merely; you will find that they hold the rest of the doctrines also. Thomas Adams, the author of *Private Thoughts on Religion*, has (observes a learned friend of mine) though he might be supposed inclined to exalt unduly the position of faith in the Christian scheme, the most trenchant and vigorous statements of the necessity for human exertion. In more recent times a sermon upon *Sin after Baptism*, which was couched in strong language, received an elucidation from another sermon entitled, "The Complete Absolution of the Penitent." The Church is perfectly aware that it would be idle to complain of a picture because a certain object in the foreground casts others for the time into the shade. She knows they are there. A picture from a different point of view would simply modify the apparent relative importance of the objects. And such a picture, corrective of misapprehension, may appear bye-and-bye.

6. In connection with the two former heads, we may ask—Would it have been wise to eject such men as Venn, or Newton, or Romaine, because many of their statements, say on election or predestination, were exaggerated? Or others, because, to the apprehension of some, their doctrine on the sacrament of the Eucharist seemed to be too violent a reaction from Zwinglianism, or their plea for the apostolicity of the ministry from the Act of Parliament idea of a clergyman's *status*—or their preaching of baptismal regeneration from the low view that baptism is a mere outward and initiatory rite—or their urging the necessity of conversion after fall, from the view that all baptised persons are safe—or their discrimination of senses of the word inspiration, from the verbal or mechanical view? These things are at least worth considering. Is it not well that time was granted? And shall not time be granted now, in justice, in charity, in practical wisdom? Lastly, if I may quote some words of my own, employed elsewhere, "The apostles' teaching was gradual, many-sided, at one time bringing one aspect of truth into view, and at another time another. It was also unstudied, and indicative of a holy recklessness as to system. It consulted the special needs of those to whom it was from time to time addressed; it did not speculate on points not revealed; it did not

hesitate to acknowledge lack of information, or even doubt where they existed. But these circumstances did not prevent its winning, but rather contributed to its winning, the world."

In right of what she presses, and in right of what she does not press, the National Church is, to her glory, *Catholic*, both in the ancient and in the modern sense of that term: *Catholic, in the ancient sense*, because she makes what the well-considered language of the Lambeth manifesto sets forth, her conditions of belief and communion: *Catholic, in the modern sense*, because, outside those conditions, she does not make men offenders for a word. Whether these are just limits of comprehensiveness I leave you to judge. I venture to think they are.

The Rev. W. SANDAY, D.D., Principal of Bishop Hatfield's Hall,
University of Durham.

THE upshot of what I shall try to say, although I may not perhaps succeed, as my experience in addressing public meetings of this kind is very slight, is that the Church ought to be as comprehensive as possible. If I may be allowed to leave that proposition in that vague shape, perhaps before I finish I may place some limits upon this comprehensiveness. It may be worth while to briefly run over the main ground why the Church ought to be comprehensive. First there is the historical ground. There always have been three distinct parties in the Church—at least from the middle of the seventeenth century, when first the Broad Church party began to rise. The other grounds I should be inclined to divide into grounds of principle and of policy. The ground of principle is simply this, no one of the three parties in the Church has an exclusive possession either of truth or of goodness. A partisan may think otherwise, but if one tries to look at things as they really are, if one places oneself outside of party and looks at things candidly and without prejudice, determined not to blink the defects on one side and determined to see the excellencies on the other, we must see that there are many points more highly developed in some one of the three parties than in the others. I suppose that the High Church party would be the one from which I should differ most widely myself, and yet I am tempted to think that there is more spirit of Christianity in the best men of that party—more of the meekness and gentleness of Christ; more of the refined and unobtrusive devoutness, which ought to be the characteristic of Christians, than even among the best men of other parties. The Christian character has been described by Keble and Newman with finer touches than by almost anyone else. I hope I owe something to these men, and I should be very glad if I could think that I owed to them much more. Each party in the Church has its own distinctive excellencies. Those excellencies become the property of the Church. Besides the interaction of one party upon the other is most valuable, and has been most marked during the last twenty or thirty years: and I dare say very much is due to these meetings in Congress. If we look around we shall see that we owe a great deal to each of these parties in turn. We owe to the High Church party the increased order, decency, and beauty of our public worship, and I think we owe to it also a generally increased sense of reverence; we owe to it also an increased sense of the continuity of Church history, which is very valuable. We owe to the Broad Church party a more sympathetic dealing with intellectual difficulties, of which we had a striking instance last night; we owe to it, also, a more liberal attitude towards science and philosophy, and we owe to it a developed exegesis—the attempt to get at the real sense of the writers of Scripture

with reference to the circumstances of their own time, and not as they may seem to us now. We owe to the Low Church party—and might perhaps owe to it more than we do—the point of which I believe they have the firmest grasp, and that is the vital and direct and individual apprehension of the person and work of Christ. I was much struck by a remark which fell from your Grace in your opening address yesterday—that the mind of the Church as a whole is distinct from the mind of each of the three parties in the Church; and what is very strange and remarkable is that we should have a distinct idea of what the Church of England is apart from those three parties—that although made up of diversities it should round itself into a united whole. That is the result of these three parties in the Church, and I think it is a very valuable result indeed. Passing from this one ground of principle to the lower ground of policy we may say this—that if any one of the three parties were excluded from the Church, it would almost lose the claim to be considered national. If there were a secession from the Church, I think it would not be a small secession; and we should imperil our right to be considered a national Church. Then the presence of these three distinct parties saves us from those sharp and dangerous antagonisms which exist on the Continent. For instance, in Belgium, France, and Germany, where the division between clericalism and liberalism rends society in two. The presence of the High Church party saves us from much of the danger of Ultramontane agitation; the presence of the Low Church party saves us from much of the bitterness of the conflict with Dissent; and that of the Broad Church party saves us from antagonism with secular thought and science. Another point is this—that the presence of these three parties gives an outlet for the expression of honest opinion. In the Church of Rome you have uniformity; but what is the value of that uniformity? It only serves to conceal, and very thinly, a great amount of real and practical infidelity. In the Church of England we have these three parties from which to choose, each with its different shades and varieties; and therefore it is fair to conclude that opinion formed under these circumstances is honest, and has the strength of conviction, and that we should thus have greater activity of spiritual and intellectual life. If we may look around us at the position of these three different parties with reference to their limits, and with reference to the limits of the Church, I think I may say that two at least of the three are content with their limits. I suppose the Low Church party may be said to be content, if we may judge by the character of the recent secessions from the Church on that side. Most of them, I believe, have been entirely in consequence of the amount of liberty allowed to their opponents, and not from any distinct reasons of their own. That, at least, is a very minor form of grievance. The Broad Church party, I think it may be said, is content. It acquiesces in the line drawn by the Wilson and Williams decision on the one hand, and the Voysey decision on the other. Every one seemed satisfied with that decision: so that we have two parties that are content with their position, and do not wish to discuss the question of limits. The one point on which the limits are being strained is on the side of the High Church party. On what principle, then, ought these limits to be imposed? I suppose, philosophically, the limits of the comprehensiveness of the Church should be the possibility of communion in worship. It is clear that divergence of opinion may be carried to such a point that the spiritual character of the worship is neutralised by the feeling of criticism, antagonism, and repugnance. If we were to place an extreme Low Churchman in a decidedly High Church, or an extreme High Churchman in a very Low Church, I am afraid that their acts of worship would not be what they should be. But, practically, we must draw a distinction between congregations and individuals. Practically it is enough to secure a fair amount of unanimity in Christian congregations, and the two extremes need not necessarily be brought together. The density of the population in England greatly simplifies the

problem with which we have to deal. In towns we have a variety of churches, and a process of natural selection takes place, and each man goes where he finds what he likes. The difficulty is chiefly in the country, and there some sort of definite limit must be imposed externally. And this leads me to deal with a measure which has been lately passed with a view to impose such a limit—the Public Worship Regulation Act. That Act may be looked at in two different lights—it may receive two different constructions. Either we may regard it as in the sense in which it was defined in the House of Commons, as an act to put down Ritualism, and in that sense it could hardly be too strongly condemned. It is strange that such a speech should come from the lips of a statesman; for not only should we put down Ritualism, but a great deal besides which we should be sorry to lose. There was a time when the Ritualists could be separated from the High Church party, but I think that time is passed now. Naturally the most chivalrous members of that party rally round the extremes. An instance of what we understand by chivalry was given in the opening address of this debate. Not only would you put down Ritualism, but you would put down a great deal more, and you would fail even to put down Ritualism. There is another sense, however, in which it seems to me that this Act is very useful: that is, as an Act for the better protection of congregations. In that sense it is not unneeded, because the clergy have large powers, which may be, and are sometimes abused; and it is not oppressive, because where the Act is interpreted in that sense there have been very few prosecutions, and the value of the Act is seen in the number of cases which are settled outside the court. It reinforces that good feeling which exists among the clergy and prevents them going against the feelings of their congregations. The remainder of what I have to say is to deprecate the tendency to draw the line at the question of vestments. In the first place there is a wide-spread feeling outside the High Church party: I speak with great deference—as I occupy the place of the unlearned—that there is a good deal to be said in the way of precedent in its favour; and many of us were surprised to hear what could thus be said in favour of those extremes. One had therefore the feeling that the law was so doubtful that the accused might have been allowed the benefit of the doubt. The example of the Scandinavian Churches shows that vestments may be safely conceded. The real question is that of doctrine, which was conceded by the Bennett judgment. It is illogical in the face of this to be too stringent in the matter of vestments. The present is an age of minor questions. Such excesses as those in vestments are best left to (a) the rise of some really great spiritual movement, or (b) the general raising of religious intelligence and deepened insight into the sense of Scripture. No party consists entirely of moderate men, and the extremes must be put up with for the sake of the good that goes along with them.

THE REV. GILBERT KARNEY.

My Lord Archbishop,—I know of but two limits of comprehension in our national Church—Evangelical truth and Apostolic order. I borrow both phrases from the noble sermon, if I may venture to say so, preached by the Bishop of Pennsylvania, in St. Paul's Cathedral, in connection with the Lambeth Conference. The Bishop likens, as I understand his simile, the mission of our Church to that of a river which goes forth through our land, distributing in clearly cut channels, the pure water of life. This, my friends, is our mission. It is to carry evangelical truth throughout the length and breadth of our land, the very truth of God revealed in

his Holy Word. And we do this on the lines of apostolical order. But now that this important subject may not pass away without some practical suggestions, permit me to clear up, so far as I can, two or three prevalent confusions of thought which are continually met with in connection with it. First of all I must earnestly protest against the idea that there is anything inconsistent between evangelical truth and apostolical order. The two have been continually placed in contrast; whereas they are in perfect harmony. Evangelical truth and its distribution are the end of our mission; Apostolical order is its means, and I think it would tend to remove many of our existing difficulties if it were clearly understood that we who prize the glorious Reformation—as one of God's best gifts to this our happy England—do appreciate fully that which has been spoken to-day as the historical continuity of our Church. It must not be supposed that because we hold that the truths vindicated for us at the Reformation are truths to be maintained at any price, that therefore we overlook the fact that our great Church is not a mere sect, but that it is to be traced almost, if not altogether, up to apostolical days; that its historical continuity is undoubted, and that all that it did at the Reformation was—using the Irishman's simile, to wash her face of that corruption which had disfigured it from the accretion of centuries of the darkness of superstition. And on the other hand, I do not see why those who lay much stress on the historical continuity of the Church should not be heartily with us in upholding, with all their force, the doctrines vindicated at the Reformation, and in supporting those who maintain them by every means in their power. Then there is another thing, my lord, which seems to me to be extremely important in these days. I have endeavoured to show that Catholic and Protestant are not terms to be used in contrast; that our Church is truly Catholic because she is truly Protestant; and that she is truly Protestant because she is truly Catholic. Her position among the Churches of Christendom is almost unique. At the Reformation she let go nothing which is clearly of divine authority; and she retained nothing that was not to be proved by the word of God. Now what I think we ought to be quite clear about is this—that there is a very great confusion of thought in these days, as between what is Catholic and what is mediæval. I think my friends, when we use terms like these we ought to understand what they mean, and that when we say, that the limits of comprehensiveness in the Church are evangelical truth and apostolical order, and that her character is at once Catholic and Protestant, it must be quite clear that by Catholic we do mean mediæval; and that while we are willing to be taken back to the Church of the past, we must insist upon being taken to the Church of the far past. My friends, there is the widest distinction in the world between what is Catholic and what is mediæval. Never were anything more uncatholic than the prominent doctrines in the ages immediately preceding the Reformation. Now we say, if you can help the Church to fulfil its mission by taking us back to what is Catholic, and Primitive, and Apostolic, and can be proven by the word of God, by all means do so. We will follow you wherever you lead us so long as we have God's word and the apostolical authority for our guide. But I must maintain this, that mediæval doctrine is inconsistent with the due discharge of our Church's mission—it is at variance with Catholic truth. There is a danger lest under the guise of a so-called Catholicism we should be landed in the mediæval system, which has wrought such terrible results—results which are even now before our eyes in certain continental Churches. There is the widest difference in the world between the Catholic doctrine of pastor's intercourse with his flock and the people's resort to their pastor to open their griefs, and the mediæval doctrine of habitual confession. There is the widest difference in the world, between the Catholic doctrine of the true presence of Christ in the heart of the faithful receiver of the Holy Communion of the body and blood of Christ, and the mediæval

doctrine of the objective presence. There is the widest possible difference between the Catholic doctrine of the sacrifice to Christ of ourselves, our souls and bodies in Holy Communion, and the medieval doctrine of the sacrifice of Christ in the Mass. Now I say, my friends, let us retain the Catholic and let us reject the medieval. And now, one word in conclusion—let us ask that the spirit in which this subject is handled may be a spirit as far as possible free from personality, and from actomania, and from ill-will. Let us remember that our Church is one of England's most cherished possessions, let us remember that her good affects the welfare of tens of thousands in every part of the world, and let us realise that there may be the widest possible difference between the man who are thus misled, and the errors by which they are misled. I had recently the opportunity of visiting, in Salisbury, the Blackmore museum. It is a museum, chiefly for the exhibition of flint implements, manufactured by different nations in the early stage of their civilisation, and I was there struck by the photograph of a man, with war face and old garments. I asked what it meant. I was informed that whilst these flint implements were being discovered, the country, to his great surprise, heard of several country clergymen and others who had supposed some of them to be their possession. On enquiry he found that a man called "Flint Jack," from the North of England, had heard of the interest excited by these implements, and he made a number of imitation copies and sold them to unsuspecting clergymen and others, who thought they were possessed of the real thing. The country of the museum was a very "canny" man, and he said to "Flint Jack"—"Will you work for me? if you make me a complete set, I will pay you well for them." And in this museum you will see side by side with the real thing, a set of the forgeries which "Flint Jack" had made, with his portrait crowning the whole. There were, you note, many unsuspecting clergymen, but only one "Flint Jack." Now I do not for a moment say that there are many who deliberately intend to foist on us medieval doctrine for Catholic truth; I do not mean to say that there are many "Flint Jacks," although Rome has sent more than one or two amongst us since the Reformation, but I say this, that if it is true, as the first speaker said, that many of the advocates of this system are young men, I earnestly wish that they would look into this matter for themselves, instead of being led by others. And to my young brother clergy I would earnestly say, that if they would read their Greek Testaments a little more, and verify garbled quotations from the Fathers by looking into the context, we should soon be able to hold out before the Church at England in the nineteenth century as Catholic truth, but which, by the grace of God given to our faithful sons, she cut away and clean rejected. For myself, I firmly believe that England, her clergy, and her laity are deeply "infected with Protestantism," and I earnestly trust that they will ever be so.

DISCUSSION.

EARL NELSON.

It is not right to go into a discussion of doctrine, and I shall not do so at this Congress. I can only say that I do not necessarily agree with what the last speaker might consider to be Catholic. At the same time I put Catholic and primitive together, and I do not mean, when I use the word Catholic, any approach to Roman error. Now in considering this question, it is of the very greatest importance that you should really understand the actual political position of the Church

of England at the present time. It is but fifty years ago—but people are beginning to forget it—that a very vital change came over the relations of the Church and State at the passing of the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act, and at the repeal of the Tests and Corporations Act. Many persons considered that it was the death-blow of the Church of England. It was not the death-blow of the Church of England, but it was the complete overthrow of the Church of England as a political engine of oppression. And we must not forget that so vital a change could not take place without leaving us for some years afterwards in a state of confusion. It began to give us back our spiritual freedom, and no one can look back at the history of the last fifty years without seeing that the position of the Church of England has been wonderfully strengthened thereby, and that by the outpouring of God's Holy Spirit we have got on most wonderfully since that time, and can compare in the increase of our work among the people of this country, nobly with any other period of our Church's history. And what is more, we do resolve to make ourselves the Church for all the people of this land. Now as to the limits, I say most decidedly that the Prayer-book should be our rule—but the Prayer-book liberally interpreted, according to every use of it that has been permitted since the Reformation. And if in adapting the Prayer-book to the use of our people there are changes in the mode of conducting the service, these are not to be done in a hurry, or without the consent of the congregation. We must, however, not attempt to bind the Church by strict legal definition of old rubrics. But I believe there is one way out of all our difficulties. If the Bishops of our Church would consult their great chapters on the subject of interpreting the Prayer-book, each for his own diocese, I believe then we should hear nothing of a breach of the State law; I believe that members of Parliament would thank everybody from the bottom of their hearts for settling a question they do not wish themselves to have any interference with. There are two dangers to be avoided. The Church of England claims to be,—and I venture to say is,—a true branch of the Catholic Church, and the limits of its comprehensiveness must be catholic and primitive. It must be based on the creeds of the undivided Catholic Church. We must desire to avoid as much as we possibly can the magnifying of small things into essentials, which is sectarianism. We must set ourselves against the addition of articles to the faith that were not accepted by the undivided Church, which is Romanism.

MR. C. H. LOVELL.

HIS lordship who has just addressed you has, I think, drawn more nearly to the real question under consideration than any of our previous speakers, because he has said his desire is to treat the Church of England as the National Church, and that is the subject which is before us—"The Just Limits of Comprehensiveness in the National Church." Allow me to remind you, if you are not aware of it, that the National Church means patronage to the extent of £4,000,000 per annum in parochial benefices, and of this Nonconformists derive no benefit whatever. I think, therefore, when we come to discuss what are the just limits of the National Church, we should not, as former speakers seem rather inclined to do, be too much talking of who should be pushed out, but our desire should be to find out who can be drawn in, and to see if we can attract our Nonconformist brethren. Do any of us doubt that we are living in a country surrounded by Christian families, educated in the Christian faith, who are good citizens, whose morality is the same as ours, and who (except as to the Church), have the same rights and privileges as ourselves? and ought we not to desire that these should become mixed up with ourselves? I

say, then, with regard to the comprehensiveness of the Church of England, our first endeavour should be to see that we do nothing to alienate the affections of those whom we acknowledge to be devout, holy, conscientious and Christian men. The next point I venture to take is that the Church should be and must be scriptural. The Church of England says so; she emphatically declares that all her teaching is based upon Holy Scripture, and she goes the length of saying that even if she has erred so to frame doctrines contrary to Scripture, Scripture is to have the paramount authority. Scripture evidently admits of various interpretations: there can be no doubt about it. Men of learning, of divine learning, of ability (the long array of whose names Canon Ryle gave to you to-day) show most distinctly that the Scriptures themselves are capable of being construed in various ways; and so wide should be the comprehensiveness of the Church of England. We should extinguish none of those who faithfully, earnestly, and devoutly place their faith on the revelation made by God, and give it that honest interpretation which as scholars and as Christians they are able to do. I go a step further and say that although the Church of England is scriptural, and although the Church of England must be dealt with as a scriptural Church, it would be absurd to deny that she has in her articles and in her formularies propounded her view of what the Scriptures teach; and having so propounded it, it is equally impossible for men to claim that they are members of the Church of England whose views are diametrically opposed to that. I confess I was somewhat surprised to hear the tone in which the first speaker this morning addressed us in regard to the ecclesiastical tribunals of this country. No Englishman does credit to his country or to himself by reviling them. No man is compelled to belong to the Church of England; if he does not like it, he can simply leave it with the full privilege of exercising his own conscience, and of propagating his own views with the liberty which this country permits to every one of her citizens. It is not hard, therefore; it is not persecution: it is simply doing that which is right and proper, that the constituted authorities require a man to keep within those limits which he first of all has sworn and engaged to observe. Let me say what I feel to be of the utmost importance in the discussion of this question: what we want is unity and unanimity; we do not want to have constant bickerings and discussions. Therefore, the Church—the National Church—should be courteous and should be charitable. It is the most undesirable thing in the world to appeal to the public tribunals in settling Church matters. It is not good Churchmanship to do so. I say so here to-day, because I mean to add to it that the proper way for the Churchman to pursue is to submit his grievance to the ordinary. No man has heard from me, either in public or in private, that I entertain the least doubt that, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred honestly submitted on both sides to the ordinary, you will have a judgment consistent with the laws and the interests of the Church. We ought not to find fault with everything we do not practise ourselves. We should be very careful not to sneer, for instance, at choirs. Surpliced choirs are within the limits of the Church of England. If so, why is anybody to be pointed at who introduces them? I do not mean to say whether I admire them; but whether I do or not, that and a great many other things are within the limits of the Church of England, and ought not to be sneered at or objected to, or made ground of opposition in any parish. What is doubtful should be liberally regarded. We should all remember that the great thing every one of us should endeavour to encourage and secure is the spirit of Christ. I am quite certain that that is not the spirit of legal contention; I am quite certain that that is not the spirit of controversy and bitterness; but I am equally certain that it is the spirit which adheres to the truth and which would sacrifice life itself in the defence of truth.

The Hon. and Rev. W. H. FREMANTLE, of St. Mary's,
Marylebone.

I RISE just to give one or two more knocks to the nail which was put into the board by Mr. Lovell just now in the beginning of his speech. That is to say, I wish to speak one or two words about the position we hold towards that vast body of our Christian brethren who have been called, and most rightly called—they could not have been called by a better title—the nonconforming members of the Church of England. I do not know how it is, but I find that at these Church Congresses they seem more and more to fall out of the account. At some of the earlier Congresses there were meetings especially devoted to the subject of the Nonconformists and what our relations towards them should be: in the present Congress, except for these few words of Mr. Lovell at the beginning of his speech, I hardly think that their name would have been mentioned at all. And yet we cannot say that they are outside the National Church of England. It is impossible for us to say so. They are baptised members of the Church. If we take some of the distinctions given already—that by Mr. Ryle—we cannot say that they are Romanists, or any approach to it; and we cannot say that they are, except in a very few instances, tinctured with that Socinianism, which is the other ground of exclusion. They are members of the same nation as ourselves, and are Christians like ourselves. And moreover we see many of them coming to our Communion from time to time. I believe that many members of our Congress are receiving hospitality from them at this very moment. His grace reminds me that the same may be said of Roman Catholics with regard to that. I heard only yesterday of one of the most eminent Nonconformists from London, who came to this town a short time ago, and who was staying with some friends. The question arose—where they should go to worship? He is an hereditary Nonconformist, and, I believe, a member of the Liberation Society. When the question arose, his host said his family were going to the Parish Church, and were going to stay to the Communion; and the guest said that he would go to the Church, and attend the Communion if no objection were made. We have a mass of persons just upon our borders; not merely near us, but who are at one with us. Why are we to make nothing of them at the Church Congress? They are doing nearly half the Christian work of this country. They are much nearer to us than some of the Christians of the Eastern and Latin Churches, which we often look upon with a desire to associate ourselves with them; and, therefore, I consider we ought to be thinking of them constantly. Moreover, if we look upon the dangers of our Church, we cannot but think that the greatest danger is their alienation from us. I have been very much pleased at the words of the speakers to-day and at other Church Congresses about the union which exists among the clergy of the Church of England now, and the very tolerant spirit which has grown up amongst us. I rejoice in it, and believe it to be most sincere. I trust that the danger of our tearing one another to pieces is passing away; but, notwithstanding that, I cannot be blind to the fact that there is another danger near us, which is much greater. That danger is this,—that there may be such an uniformity, such an agreement amongst ourselves, as that the clergy and those persons who are their nearest adherents, may be welded together in one solid mass, whilst they are growing more unbrotherly towards the rest of the nation, and steeling themselves against the great Protestant community which lies outside the lines of strict conformity. There have been times in the history of the Church when there appeared to be no controversies: there was a time when the Pope said "*Nemo reclamatur, nemo resistit*;" but no one will think that things were then at the best. That was a time when

God's witnesses were all but extinct, and the Church had reached its lowest degradation. And it may be the same with us if we do not give heed to the warnings of history. I read every week one of the Nonconformist periodicals, one which is circulated to the number of 120,000 every week, and I see this danger in the way which many persons do not see who do not accustom themselves to that kind of regimen. While I see there is a great estimation on the part of Nonconformists of all the good in the Church of England, and a constant effort in this periodical to bring before its readers the many good works in the Church of England, there is a sense of social wrong and a sense of growing alienation which is most painful to consider, most painful because it is so unnecessary. I should have liked to hear many things said to-day to show that this feeling was passing through the minds of the speakers. I am not myself going to try to bring forward any nostrums of my own whereby any kind of reconciliation may be effected; but there are two great principles which always appear to me ought to be kept in mind, and the keeping of which in mind might perhaps produce eventually a closer union between ourselves and the great Protestant bodies. The one is that great simple truth, that our religion consists not of outward order, but of faith; that great truth which the evangelical party in the Church of England especially holds most dear. I should have liked to have heard that spoken out by those who are the chosen champions of that party, by those who claim that name, and that it should not have been left to one who is not able to claim it in that exclusive sense. We should hold fast to the fact that our religion consists of faith, and that all other matters of external order, of services, and of our churchyards, are but of secondary consideration. We do not want to put these aside as of no importance; but we must maintain that faith in Christ is the real standing ground, and the true point of reconciliation. The other principle is this. I think it is being felt more and more that religion does not consist so much in services, and in those things which are spoken of in an exclusive sense as religion; but it consists in the love and in the exercise of right relations towards our fellow men, and the more we feel that we are bound together as a national community for national objects, the more hope there will be that these contentions about Nonconformity and such things will cease to disturb us, and that we shall be bound together more and more for the highest purposes for which society exists. I trust that I have spoken nothing in referring to Nonconformity in the Church Congress which may be distasteful to this assembly. I feel myself that the importance of the question of our relation to Nonconformists is of the very gravest kind, and that it is very apt to be omitted on such occasions; and this must be my excuse for troubling you with these remarks.

MR. THOMAS LAYMAN.

If I had time to address you at sufficient length on the importance of that view of the matter which has just been put before you by Mr. Fremantle, I should at once take up the ground which he has covered, and, perhaps a little to his surprise as coming from the source it does, I should even go a little further than he has ventured to do. If I, as a member of what is thought and spoken of as an extreme party, if I venture to say that from my heart and soul, I look upon every baptised person here, and every baptised person within this realm, let him call himself what he will—Wesleyan, Nonconformist, Churchman or anything else—every man on whom the Holy Spirit in baptism has rested, as a member of the Holy Catholic Church. But it would ill become me to occupy

time, which has to a certain extent been occupied too much the same way. Still the idea came into my mind that perhaps I should be pardoned if I strengthened his view, inasmuch as he expressed a desire that some one should do so. The general question can be best arrived at in its fulness if we take it in one or two apparently very minute particulars; and I think the limits of the comprehension of the Church of England will be best seen if I ask all of you—if I ask our right rev. fathers who sit beside me—patiently and lovingly to accept all in their arms who come within these limits, even though they may in these two particulars to some extent transgress, or appear to transgress. Now the two particulars I wish to mention are connected with the reverent administration of that which is the highest act of Christian worship, of course I mean Holy Communion. Now I plead for one thing in Holy Communion which is not allowed by the Prayer-book, and I plead for it earnestly, and I plead for it because I believe that without it we should do nothing to evangelise that vast mass of persons who are now outside our mode of worship, and we shall do nothing whatever to reconcile Nonconformists to our mode of worship, because it is a distinct feature of their own worship—need I say I mean the singing of hymns? I am very much encouraged by the good humour with which this statement is received. But, ladies and gentlemen, there is an obverse side to this shield. It may come upon you with some surprise when I tell you that although hymns are so general, and universally so highly appreciated and so much loved, there is no provision whatever made for singing a simple hymn during the celebration of Holy Communion. That as a fact in itself would not be deserving of your notice, but it has, I venture to say—pardon me for using a very strong word—an awful bearing. That is not too strong a term, because in the only two instances wherein the powers of the law have been forced to the bitter end, the singing of a hymn during Holy Communion was one of the penal charges. If the gentleman who says “No” had seen the penal charges as I have seen them, he would be aware that singing a hymn was one of the penal charges. Now I am not going to occupy your time any further upon that point, because I want you to go home, and think that I have pleaded here earnestly for the extension—for the preservation—of a use which up to this present moment is not permitted by the Prayer-book. Now I have another particular in which I have to plead equally as strenuously for an observance which is absolutely, in the very plainest language of which the English is capable, declared to be, if not commanded, at any rate allowed by the Prayer-book itself. And that this statement may be placed before you in words that none of you will dare to controvert, I will place it before you in the words of one—he is present, and therefore I dare not sing his praises—but when I say that the words are the words of the Lord Bishop of Carlisle, you will at least allow that if I am mistaken I am mistaken in good company. On page 72 of his work called “Guide to the Parish Church,”—and such a work must have necessitated great deliberation and care—he uses these words: “That the ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof are,”—I am going to use his words,—“Now this rule would involve the use of several vestures of which some of the attendants at parish churches have never heard, such as the vestment, cope, tunicle and alb; and strictly speaking,”—this is the pith of it—“they ought to be used in every parish church in this land.” Now I am very well aware that it is quite within the power of that learned prelate—and in fact in a letter to myself he has modified the views which he entertained. I cannot be expected to point out to you, as I pointed out to him, that I thought his reasons were eminently unsatisfactory; but the only point then that I can leave with you in the one minute allowed to me is this—that whether that view of his be right or wrong, if it were a view that could commend itself to a clergyman of the highest scholarly ability, occupying the high position he then held, if he could in the face of the whole Church put forth state-

ments like these, surely, gentlemen, surely you clergymen who are here, surely, my lord archbishop and bishops, it is a view that at any rate has something that can be said for it.

The Bishop of CARLISLE.

MY Lord Archbishop, Ladies and Gentlemen,—I am taken quite by surprise in rising to speak to you just now. I had fully intended to keep my mouth closed upon this occasion. I need scarcely say that many things have fallen during the discussion this morning which would tend to stir almost anybody to rise and speak. But I had passed a self-denying ordinance that I would not inflict myself upon you for one moment; nor would I have done so had it not been for the statement by Mr. Layman. What is my explanation and apology? It is an explanation which I think many people would find it very well to remember, and sometimes adopt, and that is, that you do not always think as an old man in the way in which you thought when you were young. It is perfectly true that some quarter of a century ago I published a little book—a very unpretending little book—called “The Guide to the Parish Church,” and it is perfectly true that in that little book I made a statement which Mr. Layman has just now read. That was five-and-twenty years ago, when I held in very good company the views I expressed in that book. They were those which were then commonly held, and I held those views in company with the late Bishop of Exeter. But I am not to be bound by every opinion that I formed as a young man. I have had time to think; and I believe that if many young men would think, they would change the views they hold at the present time. I have had since that time to go into the question very carefully. I have gone into it as a member of the Ritual Commission, and as chairman of the Committee of Convocation of Canterbury on this subject; and I have gone through the subject in the most careful and thoughtful way that has been possible for me. The result has been that I have changed my views. I believe that these vestments are *not* legal, and the edition from which Mr. Layman has quoted my words is now withdrawn, and another edition has been for some time in preparation, and in the course of a month or two Mr. Layman will be able to find in it, not what I believed five-and-twenty years ago, but what I believe now.

The Rev. JOSEPH BARDSLEY, of Stepney.

MR. FREMANTLE remarked that enough had not been said on the importance of faith. I desire to notice this in connection with the basis of Church comprehension suggested by Lord Nelson, viz., that he would make the Prayer-book our rule, and to be interpreted by each bishop for his own diocese. And I inferred from some observations of the noble lord, that he intended the Prayer-book to the exclusion of the Thirty-nine Articles. This most certainly is not the basis of comprehension laid down by our Church. The Liturgy was designed to secure uniformity of worship; whilst subscription to the Articles was intended to secure unity in doctrine. I think it is quite clear that King Charles I. had a source of comfort which does not fall to the lot of our gracious Queen Victoria: for in his Majesty's declaration, prefixed to the Articles, he says—“We take comfort in this, that all clergymen have most willingly subscribed to the Articles,” and they “all agree in the true, usual, literal meaning of the said Articles.” It is evident that all the clergy of our day do not willingly subscribe, for some call them the 40 stripes save one; and it is

equally clear that all do not take them according to their true and literal meaning, because a defence has been set up for taking them in a non-natural sense. Lord Nelson said he would have the judgment of the ordinary made final. I feel the greatest disposition to submit to the ruling of the ordinary; but I doubt whether the bishops themselves would desire that it should in all cases be absolutely decisive; because we should have one judgment to-day, and a different one to-morrow—there would be one judgment and practice in one diocese, and a widely different judgment and practice in another. Mr. Layman told the meeting that the Prayer-book does not permit the singing of a hymn at the celebration of the Holy Communion, and represented as a great hardship, that the Incumbent of St. Alban's, Holborn, had brought against him as a *penal charge* the singing of a hymn in the Communion Service; but then it should be remembered it was not for singing an ordinary hymn, but one associated with false doctrine and superstition. The reader of the first paper, in opening this discussion, gave us to understand that the just limits of comprehensiveness are to be fixed, not by Parliament, not by the Privy Council, but by reference to the teaching of the Catholic Church. The Hon. Mr. Wood being a layman might be pardoned for not remembering what is the solemn vow made by every clergyman at his Ordination, that he will "give faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrines and sacraments, and discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as" not only "this Church," but also as this "Realm hath received the same." When I heard Mr. Wood protesting so strongly against the right of Parliament to touch things sacred, I was greatly surprised to find that notwithstanding this earnest protest, the only statement in his paper which he attempted to support by evidence, viz., the use of the vestments, &c., was founded on appeal to the Ornaments Rubric, which is avowedly based upon "the authority of Parliament." This being Mr. Wood's only alleged authority for the use of vestments, we might have naturally expected that by him at least the authority of Parliament in such matters would have been viewed with more favour. Mr. Wood informed us that great difficulties arise from the divisions of Christendom. This certainly would be the case if the question under consideration had been how to bring about the reunion of Christendom; but our subject being the just limits of comprehension in the National Church, we find that she has prescribed these, not by an appeal to the teaching of the Church in pre-reformation times, but by endeavouring to ascertain the mind of God as contained in his holy Word; and the limits so gathered she has laid down in her Articles and Prayer-book. Her appeal is invariably to the Scriptures. Why, in the judgment of the National Church, ought the three creeds to be received? Is it because they were accepted by the early Church before the divisions of Christendom occurred? No, this is not the reason; but these creeds, she says, "ought thoroughly to be received and believed; for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." She follows the teaching of the early Church so far and no farther than she discovers it to accord with the infallible word of God. Why, in the judgment of our Church, did she discard certain errors and superstitions which had been taught in pre-reformation times? Because "grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God." So decided is our Church in appealing to the Scriptures, that instead of "seeking the will of God" in "the trade of custom, the path of the fathers, and the practice of the Church," she says in the homily on the reading and knowledge of Holy Scripture,—“Therefore, forsaking the corrupt judgment of fleshly men, let us diligently search for the well of life in the books of the Old and New Testament, and not run to the stinking puddles of men's traditions, devised by men's imagination for our justification and salvation.” I heard with some surprise the statement of Mr. Wood, viz., that the Latin and English services are essentially the same. I understood Lord Nelson to suggest

that it would be well to allow as the just limits of comprehension the teaching and practices authorized by the various English Prayer-books. Though I cannot agree in thinking this admissible, I may remark that even the first Prayer-book of Edward, which is the one the Ritualists much prefer, teaches us to pray that we may be delivered "from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities." Is it possible to conceive that the same men can be said to have given us a service identical in its teaching with the Latin service-books, when in our Articles and Liturgy they condemn in the strongest terms the Romish doctrines of purgatory, pardons, and the invocation of saints and angels; when they declare of transubstantiation that it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and giveth occasion to many superstitions; when they condemn the sacrifices of masses as involving blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits; when they affirm that to adore the consecrated elements of bread and wine is idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians? It seems to me to be impossible to contend that the English and Latin service books are essentially the same, without ignoring the many vital points of difference by which they are marked, as well as the whole history of the controversies of the sixteenth century. In order to show that the Ritualistic party has been persecuted, Mr. Wood alluded to the way in which united congregations and their ministers had been harassed; and he mentioned St. James's, Hatcham, and St. Alban's, Holborn. No doubt the congregations were united, because all other parishioners had been driven away from their parish churches by the innovations made by Mr. Tooth and Mr. Mackonochie. But if in this way they secured united congregations, they certainly failed in bringing about a united parish. Last Easter twelve-months the people assembled in very large numbers to elect churchwardens for St. James's, Hatcham. Possibly the majority consisted of Mr. Tooth's supporters. But it was demanded in the appointment of the people's warden that none should be allowed to vote but resident ratepayers. What was the result? About twenty supported the nominee of the Ritualists, whilst about 200 voted for the gentleman who was in favour of the services being conducted in accordance with what for centuries has been regarded as the Protestant Reformed Prayer-book of the Church of England. Mr. Wood declares that those with whom he is associated are prepared to make any sacrifices rather than acknowledge the authority and decisions of the Privy Council. What they ask, he says, is permission to obey the rubrics; that is, they want, and take permission, to act upon their own interpretation of the rubrics, setting at defiance not only the Privy Council, but, as Mr. Wood avows, those of the bishops who have lent themselves to the Privy Council. Thus they deliberately set up their own authority as the rule of their official conduct, to vindicate what they are pleased to call Church authority, and to justify their defiance of the lawfully constituted courts of the realm. The clergy knew when they voluntarily sought the positions which they now fill that the final court of appeal was the Judicial Committee of Privy Council: clearly, then, their solemn and distinct compact demands loyal obedience to the decisions of this court. A national Church should not be narrow or needlessly exclusive in fixing the terms of Communion; and in this respect, however much we may differ, we have no quarrel with High Churchmen. But we cannot confound them with the Ritualists, who have restored those distinctive doctrines and practices which our Church discarded at the Reformation.

The Rt. Hon. and Most Rev. the PRESIDENT.

BEFORE this great debate comes to a close, I desire to say a few words on the part of a despised portion of the flock of Christ, whom I think the first speaker would allow to exist, but not by any means to be obeyed—the bishops of the Church of England. It is, I think, often supposed that whereas the presbyters are disposed for change, and disposed to view small things with indifference, the bishops, on the contrary, are always busying their mind about trifles, and are very anxious to interfere wherever the smallest change is to be made. I don't think that is a fair account of the position of the bishops, and I wish just to state what I conceive their position to be. Now, with regard to what has been said as to suits about doctrine and about ritual. As to doctrine, I may just remark in passing that in a certain diocese there has been for sixteen years only one prosecution connected either with doctrine or with ritual, and that was connected with doctrine and not with ritual, and on that occasion a layman came forward on behalf of a great society with a large sum of money, which he wished to put in the hands of the bishop for the prosecution of a clerk on the ground of doctrine. The diocese was the diocese of York, and the layman was the first speaker to-day. I only mention that in passing. I do not bring it at all as a charge. But with regard to the distinction between doctrine and ritual—and that there is a distinction has been very clearly shown by another speaker—a very clear and broad distinction—everybody has in his own hands a remedy against the sermon, and many of them take it. They pay only a limited attention to it whilst it is going on, and speak about it in the churchyard afterwards. And so the man as it were washes his hands of the responsibility of the sermon. That is the clergyman's responsibility, unless he has borrowed it; and no parishioner is in the slightest measure committed to the sermon. It may so pain and shock the layman that he may see fit to take some steps; but as a rule, and speaking broadly, the sermon does not so immediately concern him. But with regard to ritual, you must bear in mind that the bishop is a trustee. He is taking the conduct of matters of ritual in his diocese as a trustee for the whole flock of Christ. Now, it was said that changes are desired to be made, that the new spiritual life finds the old condition of things too limited, and must have new ones. That may be so; but the question really is whether the parish church is the proper arena in which to fight out the battle of these new changes; and whether changes to which the consent of Convocation cannot be obtained, to which the Act of Uniformity cannot be bent and turned; and to which the laity of the Church of England, as a whole, are not inclined—whether these ought to be introduced one by one by the clergyman on his own responsibility into the parish church where he is, and so the battle of new usages be fought, not in the councils of the Church—the place where they may legitimately be debated—but in the parish church, where we meet for worship only, where all ought to be, if possible, peace and unity. I do not wish to pursue that subject, or to say anything that would add acrimony to this debate. Far from it. As far as possible my mind is entirely bent the other way. I only wish it to be understood that in desiring that these changes shall not be wrought without authority, the bishops desire to execute the solemn trust which they have to hold on behalf of the laity, and it is in that way they come sometimes into antagonism with those who wish to make the changes. I think that the reason the first speaker gave for saying that the bishops should not be obeyed, was that they had lent themselves—I hope I don't misquote him—to the secular courts. I think those were the words. Now that means, I suppose, that the bishops say the same thing as the courts. They are called secular courts, but I don't call the Court of Arches a secular court.

But it means that they say the same thing as the secular courts. Look how I stand: ordained a long time ago, I have never seen the usage of vestments, and if anybody asked me, before these things came under the notice of the Privy Council, whether I could approve of them as things legal and customary or not, I should have been obliged to answer "No," and my answer would have been that of common sense and truth. So I think. But after the Privy Council had once pronounced, I must not say the same thing any more. It is all the same true, and my conviction is exactly the same, but I have been so unfortunate as to find the highest court of the realm in agreement with me, and from that moment my opinion is invalid. And so that we are to understand the advice given by the distinguished layman, to whose high qualities I do the utmost justice, the advice is this, that the meaning of "Will you reverently obey your ordinary?" is "Will you obey him in all cases in which he does not happen to agree with the secular courts?" Well, now, I do ask this assembly to consider where we are and where we are going to. We have had to-day representatives of all the chief parties in the Church. There are terms on which these parties can live together. There is a state of things conceivable in which it would be found to be impossible for them to go on together. But at present this Church of England is so full of life, is doing such enormous work in leavening the population with the true level of the gospel of Christ, that it seems to me most deplorable—a thing to make the angels weep—that we should be going on in a course which may cause the candle of the Church of England as a National Church to be taken away—and which will, if that comes to pass, plunge this Church of the nation in the bitterest controversy and the greatest confusion for several years after the change has taken place. Many people are preparing for that change, and I have in my hand, published on the 1st October, 1878, the day on which the Church Congress opened, a plan for the separation of Church and State. It is prepared by a gentleman who is well known in connection with the Ritualist party, and I have not had time to master it. To go into it now therefore would not be respectful to the speaker. It has, in fact, been only put into my hands to-day. I may just say that in his prefatory remarks he expects to keep all the churches, and the churchyards, and I think he expects to have parsonages where there are none. But I am not quite sure about that. At all events, he expects to get a good deal, and then the rest is entirely to go. And you will be rather surprised to hear that it will commence with the complete disbandment of the eighteen or twenty thousand clergy that now exist in the Church of England; because, as I read it, they may immediately apply for compensation for their removal, and forthwith their connection with the Church may be entirely terminated. This is a financial operation that would stagger the Chancellor of the Exchequer. But what is to become of the people if you offer an inducement to all their ministers to depart from their flocks? Its aspect, from a spiritual point of view, is infinitely more startling than it is from a financial. And all for what? This gentleman's interest in it is quite clear. He wants the views to prevail which were so very eagerly urged by the first speaker, and wants to leave to the Church those things which the great council of bishops has condemned in a modified way. He wants to do that, in spite of the bishop who has the misfortune just to use the same words as the secular court happens to have said, and he wants to do it by means of disestablishing the Church. Now, I must not occupy your time, but there is this significant fact that I was told by a member of Parliament a little time ago. He said that he had gone over to Liberationist views, and the reason he and several others had done so was, that it was felt the Ritualists were able, behind the loop holes of the old established Church, to fight every inch of the ground, and to fight it with more or less success—nobody more so than the author of this scheme. He said that he had, therefore, joined the Liberation Society, because

with disestablishment the influence of the Ritualists would end. I do not know which is right, you know. I remember a certain case of a man who saw that the bough of an old and venerable tree encroached upon his windows, and made his house somewhat damp. He determined to have that bough down at all events, and so he got a large saw, and got on the branch, and sawed with might and main, and very soon had that bough down. But he had forgotten one slight circumstance—he was himself on the wrong side of the incision. One word in conclusion. After listening to this debate, I feel it to be consistent with my position to offer one piece of advice. It may be that the Church of England shall be disestablished, and I am not one of those who have an abject terror of such a state of things. There are circumstances under which it would become our duty, one and all of us, to wish for it; but in the meantime I take a practical view: and when I think of this great place in which we are, and the great change which has taken place here with reference to Church opinion, and when I think that the work going on here is repeated elsewhere in 100 towns in the kingdom, as well as all over our villages; when I think of the strong pulses of spiritual life that are beating through the frame of our national Church; when I think of all this I say, why should we help her to dissolution by quackery and mischievous nostrums? Why should we not rather go on our knees, and when we say our prayers thank God for this national Church that He has visibly blessed by his presence? And why should we not make it an earnest petition—whatever our views may be, whether of this party or that—“May it never be my lot to do anything to injure that which God has thus visibly blessed!”

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 2nd.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S took the Chair
at 2.30 P.M.

THE CHURCH'S WORK:—

(a.)—IN MOUNTAINS, MOORS, AND DALES.

(b.)—AMONG NAVVIES, BRICKMAKERS, CANAL POPULATIONS, &c.

THE LORD BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.

My Christian Brethren,—Before I proceed to discharge the somewhat anomalous duty which falls upon me, in consequence of the absence of His Grace the President, of calling upon myself to read my own paper, I wish to say that I cannot sufficiently express the satisfaction I feel at finding myself once more in Yorkshire, and in Sheffield.

PAPERS.

(a.)—THE LORD BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.

IN that which I am about to say I shall confine myself to one division of the subject announced:—“the Church's work in Mountains, Moors, and Dales.” The other section is important, but it is a different thing. Nor can I do much more than indicate the difficulties of the problem. Others may shew how it has been, or may be, solved. I do not think it has received sufficient attention. We hear much

of dealing with the masses: hardly enough of the difficulty of dealing with sparse populations. In modifying the law of plurality and in regulating curates' stipends. Parliament has regarded population, not area: and the same principle governs the action of the Ecclesiastical Commission. Yet area is surely an important element in calculating clerical labour. I had a parish in this diocese with 500 people in about 1000 acres. There is a parish in my own diocese with 217 people in 20,000 acres. Observe the difference of labour entailed in each case. Yet the Ecclesiastical Commissioners augmented the former benefice, but probably would not augment the latter, if it were necessary.—which, happily, it is not. In my diocese there are undivided parishes of 30,000, 40,000, and even 50,000 acres. One of these is bigger than half Rutland, and than the whole of more than one county in Scotland. In such cases, the parochial system breaks down. How can it be otherwise, where, from distance and bad roads, it is almost a day's work, in some cases, to visit a single parishioner? Besides this, such parishes are generally among the worst endowed in the kingdom. There are few rectories among them: and, from the poverty of the soil in these wild regions, the vicarages are very small. Many of them were appropriated to some neighbouring monastery, so that, the great tithes being now in lay hands, they have no local claim on the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. They are generally so poor that their incumbents cannot maintain curates. Owing to their small population they often get less help from the two Curates' Societies than far richer places do. Their incumbents are seldom men of means, since these are not attractive places to live in; while the labour lacks the interest and excitement by which men of good position and wealth are not uncommonly led to throw themselves into the work of a large town. Nor can the same help be looked for in such places, which, in parishes more favourably situated, is freely given by wealthy landowners. A great squire likes his own parish church and its services to be in good working order. But he sometimes forgets the parish on the moors, whence he draws income, but which he rarely visits except for a few days in August.

Such parishes then stand at a disadvantage as compared with others, even if we only consider the Church in its economical relations. But this is not all. Not only is it difficult in such places for the pastor to reach his flock: it is harder still for him to get his flock together for worship and instruction. Where people live six or eight miles from church, it is no wonder if they cease to be Churchmen: it is a mercy if they do not become heathen. Doubtless Dissenters have done much for such people: I thank them for it: but it is our work, and we ought to have done it ourselves. Moreover persons so situated are apt to be less accessible to pastoral visitation than those who live more in the world. They tend to become as rough, suspicious, and surly as their own sheep-dogs. And they too often have a conventional morality with which it is hard to deal. This is true of all classes: but these are peculiarly tenacious of old ways of thinking and acting: and "old paths" are not always good paths.

The difficulties inherent in these cases are sometimes increased, for a time at least, when mineral wealth is suddenly found in the bosom of some pastoral glen. But such a case falls under the head to be considered presently. And the evil tends to work its own cure. Means are often forthcoming for a curate's stipend, when this occurs; and the mining grants of the Commissioners provide further aid.

I must point out another difficulty largely felt in such places. Some of these benefices are so poor and otherwise so unattractive, that nobody will take them. In more accessible positions the mere poverty of a living would not be so great a hindrance; it might be held (if under £100 per annum) with an adjoining benefice. But this is seldom possible in our mountains and moors. The church of a poorly endowed benefice standing in the midst of them is pretty certain to be more than three miles from its nearest neighbour. The Act of 13 and 14 Vic., c. 98, has dealt a heavy blow to the Church in the mountains. Under it, many small livings remain, and must remain, vacant.

Indeed, when clergymen are willing to accept such pieces of preferment, it is not always to the advantage of the parishes concerned that they have been ready to do so. It sometimes happens that a clergyman, not perhaps one of the most cultivated of his order, is set down in a retired valley without a single educated man within reach. Everything about him tends to pull him down, rather than to lift or hold him up. His only possible companions are the farmer or the mining-captain. No wonder that he sometimes slides into their ways, which are not always good ways for a clergyman to follow. I do not mean that this is the normal state of things; but it is a state of things which exists. Had a clergyman in such a position been only a curate, the remedy would have been easy. Being an incumbent, he is a fixture for life, and the cause of religion in that place is thrown back for a generation. Perhaps Dissenters throw themselves into the gap; and if they do, again I thank them for it; but there ought not to have been a gap left open. However, we need not suppose so extreme a case. The sense of isolation alone is very disheartening even to those who are able to resist the evil influences of degrading associations.

I will now turn to the remedies for, or palliatives of, these evils, which have occurred to my mind. The first step is to call due attention to the subject. Too little interest is felt in these nooks and corners of our own land. The back-woods of Canada, the mysterious regions of Central Africa, even the slums and alleys of Sheffield and Manchester, appeal to the imagination. People know and care little about the spiritual condition of those who inhabit the remoter districts of this island.

Then, I think, we want some legislative help. Some relaxation is needed as regards the limits imposed by Parliament on the power to hold benefices in plurality. Three miles is too small a distance, and £100 a year as the maximum value for one of the livings is too low a figure, when the law is brought to bear upon the parishes whose case we are considering.

Until we get some such modification introduced into the existing law, I see no course but either to keep a very small benefice vacant, and to license a neighbouring incumbent to the cure during vacancy (a course which in any poor diocese is unhappily not uncommon); or else to consolidate it, in the way provided by Act of Parliament, with some adjoining living. I may remark that we need greater facilities of consolidation for both town and country. I should be glad to see the Bill brought in two or three years ago by the Bishop of Exeter, introduced once more with certain modifications. And among those modifications I should be particularly glad to see the following brought forward. We want power to charge consolidated benefices with a curate's stipend; just as the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, after making up a living to £300 per annum, will, in certain cases, endow a curacy with £120 a year out of the tithes or other property in their hands. I should like to see power given to unite benefices on condition that £120 of their joint annual value be payable to a curate. There are many cases in which an incumbent and a curate are far better than two incumbents. And it would meet some of the objections commonly made against rolling two single incumbents into one, if we could compel the incumbent produced by that process to keep a curate. Such a measure, useful in both town and country parishes, would be especially useful in such places as those of which I have now been speaking.

Next, I think the Ecclesiastical Commissioners ought to consider area as well as population in making grants. The question is not, "How many souls a single clergyman has to minister to?" but "How much work he has to do?" A population of 500 in 1000 acres, and a population of 500 in 20,000 acres, are plainly very different things. The same principle should be taken into account in the proceedings of the Additional Curates' and Pastoral-Aid Societies. Unluckily, these difficulties are little felt in the richest and most influential parts of the kingdom, in the East, in the South, and in the fat Midland shires. They are felt in the North, and in Wales: perhaps also, to some extent, in the West of England. But we, who suffer from them, are in a minority. No doubt Diocesan Spiritual-Aid Societies, where such societies have been formed, may do something for such cases. But this leads me to another point.

The use of numerous School-Chapels and Mission-houses is an obvious palliative. But, when we have got them, how are they to be served? The incumbent, even with such a staff of curates as we can reasonably expect him to employ, cannot bear the whole burden. Thus we are thrown back upon the grave question of either giving mission to lay-readers, or ordaining deacons under less stringent conditions either of previous preparation or of subsequent employment than those which at present exist. I do not want to travel into this question now. I would only remark that the subject which I have brought before you gives especial importance to it.

But I would venture to ask (and this may be reckoned as my final suggestion)—Are not these cases of a nature to demand some modification of the laws by which the parochial system is at present

maintained? I have shown that the parochial system, the general excellence of which I would be the first to assert, nevertheless partially breaks down at this point. But the parochial system was made for man, and not man for the parochial system. And even if we regard Church-order, it is the diocese, and not the parish, which forms the original unit of ecclesiastical organisation; and therefore I do not see why our parochial system is to be maintained inviolate, where it is a hindrance and not a help. Would it not be possible to organise a body of diocesan missionary clergy, assisted by lay-readers, and acting under the Bishop's orders, who should be authorised to visit such outlying corners as are practically no-man's-land, due care being taken to avoid collision with incumbents in matters which are really essential to the maintenance of their rightful authority? In other words, cannot the Church of England take in hand the work done by preaching friars in the middle ages, and by the itinerant preachers of the eighteenth century?

One word more and I have done. I have nothing to say in general about the merits or disadvantages of an ornate service. These will vary in some degree, "according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners." But I feel pretty certain that the effect of such a worship, when applied to the Church in the mountains, is invariably to repel, and not to attract. And let me add, a refined taste will reject it as incongruous and out of place. What suits York Minster very well, would be a lame and feeble parody at Glaisdale, or at Midhope. A simple, but not therefore necessarily a dull or dreary service, accompanied by plain and faithful teaching which goes straight to the heart, is what is wanted, and will be appreciated in the Mountains, Moors, and Dales.

The BISHOP added:—At the beginning of my paper, I told you that I should not do much more than indicate the difficulties of the problem, and that others would show how they had been, or might be, solved. No one, I believe, is better able to tell you how they *have been* solved, than my friend the Rev. Canon Boyd, Vicar of Arncliffe, whom I now call upon to read the next paper.

(a.)—The Rev. CANON BOYD.

IT is with difficulty I can imagine why I have been asked to read a paper to this august assembly, for our leading journal said, a short time ago, that after a priest had been twenty years in the same country place, he is not worth his salt; and as I have been twice twenty and more, in a very remote parish in the dales, with charge of some 250 souls, sixteen miles away from a railway station, I own my incompetency: but I submit to authority, and without further questioning the fitness of the appointment, I set myself to do what I can.

But amid all the questions and topics that agitate the Church and the world, my subject can only have a very limited intent. The issues are small, the population is small, and the blemishes and

ills that exist can only affect a small member of the whole body ; and though we know if one member suffer the whole body suffers, yet a pain in so small a member as the tip of the finger is but a trifle after all.

Much of what may be said of the Church in the dales must of necessity apply to any remote country locality ; so that there does not remain much which is peculiar to such a district.

The "Dales," I suppose, may be described as those districts which lie near the sources of our rivers ; where the little rivulets and tributaries water narrow valleys, which run up to the water-sheds of a country. These narrow dales, separated from each other by *ridges*, more or less elevated, and consisting entirely of grass land, afford occupation to a few labourers and their families—our population lies almost entirely in the valley or dale. For example, I cannot go from my Church north or south or west, to any neighbouring village (not in the dale) without mounting 1000 feet.

Our villages are situated generally about two or three miles from each other ; each with a population of from 50 to 100 souls more or less. We have usually few resident landlords ; but we have still some specimens of that good old-fashioned class of proprietors who farm their own land—yeomen as we call them, or statesmen—and who form a wholesome link between the big landowners, and the tenant farmers.

The character of these men is often strikingly full of interest and value : upright, independent, true, fond of their ancestral homes, they form a good cement to the other elements of our society.

The other inhabitants among whom our work lies are the tenants and their labourers. They too are a somewhat peculiar class as a rule : they abide in the dales, and though they move from farm to to farm, are always found to return. They are by nature very intelligent, reserved, slow to give their confidence, but that once won, they are steadfast and true, and full of affection and kindliness.

I can look back and see considerable amendment in their general character and manner of life. This may be attributed to the improved day schools and sunday schools, to a higher tone among them of public opinion, and to more life and vigour in the efforts that have been made for their spiritual improvement.

Our *churches* are, with few exceptions, in excellent order, and afford ample room for our diminishing population : and our *schools* are "sufficient and efficient" as the phrase is.

In a word there is little or no fault to be found with the *material* of our work ; our difficulties and hindrances lie in other directions.

As to my brethren of the clergy, when I read the account of what their condition was in the last century, or, more recently, the account of them given in a paper in the *Edinburgh Review*, in which the writer says "the condition of the mountain clergy at the beginning of this century" (or even so lately as twenty years ago) "would be well described by the picture which Lord Macaulay draws of the clergy *in general* in the seventeenth century"—if that be so, then we may thankfully recognise a very marked improvement : the drunkard to whom they refer has gone out of date, the sluggard is hardly to be found.

Of our *difficulties*, one of the greatest, which is inherent in the position and circumstances of a clergyman in such a place as I am thinking of, is his peculiar and extreme *isolation*. The *want* of inter-communion with a fellow labourer, who has the same work and the same interests occupying his mind, is something more trying than town clergy can conceive. I have in my mind a village in a remote valley where there is no clerical neighbour to the west or north or south, and none to the east for five or six miles, and then only one, and he has no horse, and there is no public conveyance. Nor can he easily run down to a neighbouring town to get a new idea, or to waken up an old one, for he is sixteen miles away.

So this isolation makes a danger of sluggishness and stagnation in a man's brain, as well as in his spiritual condition : danger, lest as to our intellect we degenerate into what has been called a state of vegetation, or for want of interest and excitement succumb, as some of our predecessors did, to the temptation of a stupid intemperance.

When I speak of the difficulties that a dale parson must have, I am thinking especially of his own spiritual life. It would seem to some so easy, so natural to be *filled* with the Spirit, in a place so far removed from the temptations from which our city brethren suffer. Some of them, when they come and cheer us with one of their rare visits, think and say, "What a place for retirement ! What a perpetual retreat ! How possible surely it would be to be *always* holy, always in the spirit, in such a seclusion as this !" But no ; solitude does not always mean peace. It was in the wilderness where our enemy found means to bring temptation before the very Master Himself. The temptations may be *different* ; nevertheless they exist.

It is so in our pastoral work : the very absence of busy occupation, itself induces idleness, and temptation to be slothful and careless.

For example—in his public ministrations—it is a great exercise of faithfulness in a parson, to sit down and carefully prepare his Sunday sermon, when he knows that if the weather be ungenial his congregation may not number twenty or thirty or even ten. And if he once begins to forget the value of his few sheep in the wilderness, or to think that it does not matter, he is sure to degenerate, on that score at least.

Then further, in consequence of a scattered flock, there is difficulty in centralizing his work, in the matter of his *schools*, his *choir*, his *missionary* meetings.

My own village only supplies some five-and-twenty children of a school age, and the rest are two miles away : and in winter and spring you cannot reasonably expect little children to walk so far in rough weather, whatever my lords of the department may say. And yet, all praise to them, the children do so with wonderful perseverance and punctuality : only, we try to provide that the girls at least, either come in the wooden clogs of the country, or have a dry pair of shoes to change. In two little villages thus situated we maintain a sort of dame's school, where the children are gathered together and learn a little.

You will see there must be in such a case considerable difficulty in retaining the services of a tolerable master who has certificate

enough to entitle him to a government grant. The difficulties of course arise from the limited number of landowners we can apply to for subscriptions, the small number of children for whom a *grant* can be claimed, and the small total of their pence, even though it be 8d. a week for farmers' children.

Or next, the *Missionary Meeting*. You have fixed the day and the hour: by way of treat to your people, you have arranged with some practised deputation, or friend of the society, to come and speak to them of the work. The day comes, and the night; a heavy downpour of rain all day, succeeded by a heavier downpour at night. You repair anxiously to the school-room, and find the master and three children. You wait awhile, and some six or seven more drop in in their soaked garments. With some misgiving you ask the deputation to pour out his eloquence to your ten or twelve people. This literally happened in a neighbouring village: and that is not so bad as one in my own village, where the audience consisted of *two*—the schoolmaster and one other.

But another of the parson's more anxious difficulties is that of the outlying villages, two or three miles away from church, or more. They come, as a rule, fairly well once in the day, if the service in church be as carefully and devoutly done as it can be and ought to be; as hearty and cheery as the best choir you can get can make it: and with a carefully prepared sermon.

But for the second service! Those in the village where the church is can come, of course; but of those who are two miles away can you expect any but the most robust, or the most devout (who are not always the most robust) to walk twice in one day? Our dales-people think that to do so *once* is, generally, as much as you can expect. Then, what can you do for them in the afternoon or evening? It may be said, once a day is enough for them; our Church certainly contemplates something more. But most probably (for the followers of Wesley are numerous) in the outlying villages there is a meeting-house of some sort, to which half-informed Church-people are tempted to resort; and where, if they do resort, their loyalty to the Church is weakened, or eventually, perhaps, estranged.

Here, then, is a case in which I would fain hear of some remedy or alleviation. Most of us find two services sufficient. What then can I do for my people, say fifty of them, in two villages, two miles from church in contrary directions? I see my neighbour the Wesleyan local coming up every Sunday afternoon to one of such villages. Sense of duty, or love for men's souls, keeps him or his substitute regularly to his work. And while I admire, and almost envy, the zeal of the system that has such an organisation, I ask, Why cannot we in the Church, even in our secluded dales, find Churchmen who shall have as much zeal, as much piety, as much love for souls as the sectarian? I cannot for a moment think we could not find as *good* instruments, as *loving*, as *capable*. And having found them (among our young farmers or our schoolmasters) I presume we could get for them episcopal licence and authority to undertake something of the sort.

Closely connected as they (the schoolmasters) still are (in the dales

at least) with the Church and the clergy, educated above their neighbours for the most part, and professionally interested in the people, I see no reason why we might not look to them for some such agency as I am thinking of. A little organisation from the authorities might soon set such an experiment on foot. Such an organisation would imply that each outlying village should have a school-room, or school-chapel, where a prepared service might be said, hymns sung, people edified and kept in the roll of the Church. And I think our national schoolmasters may be found the most eligible instruments for such a purpose. I know a case, exactly in point, and in operation. The village is five miles from the Church: the schoolmaster (mainly paid by a kindly layman) is chosen with this in view as part of his work. On wet days, and often in the winter months, he reads some prayers from the Prayer-book, and a plain sermon, and a few hymns are sung; the people are satisfied and edified.

And if such schoolmasters were sanctioned by the Bishop of the Diocese, and licensed for this object, I cannot but think much good service might be done, and a very useful instrumentality for outlying places be made available.

Such distant outposts of the great army are a long way from the front. Nevertheless, if some of the improvements that have been suggested in our cathedrals were ever adopted, or our bishops and their cathedrals as much increased in number as some of us desire, it might be possible that such remote places might be cheered by an occasional visit from the mother Church: the parson would be encouraged in his work, would feel his isolation lessened, and would recognise more fully his close connection with the main body; whereas now, in some places, he seems so far from the centre, that it is but indistinctly and feebly he feels the pulses and throbs of the heart.

If our present number of bishops were physically able to do such a thing (which, overtasked as they are, is simply impossible), fancy what a cheer it would be to the parson to have his diocesan stay in his parsonage for a week or so, to have him visit his schools, his outlying villages, his Sunday work, giving counsel or reproof or encouragement as the case might be!

I have said that the tone and character of the clergy have much improved; but if the Church is to retain her hold on her people in the dales, daily advancing as they are in knowledge and attainments, though not in numbers, or regain what she has lost, we must find men of more culture and wider experience than can be expected while so many of the benefices are of such miserably small value. You can hardly expect a parent to send his lad to college, with a view to holy orders, on the prospect of £150 per annum. In the deanery of North Craven, out of seventeen benefices eight are under £200. Patrons have, of course, an increasing difficulty in finding suitable persons to present to them (notably in the dioceses of Carlisle and Ripon). And this difficulty is increased by the fact that, while much has been done to improve the stipends of curates, so little has been done for small incumbencies.

This poverty *intensifies* many of the difficulties I have referred to in the life of a dales-parson. Unable to keep even a pony, he is debarred much possible intercourse with his brethren, as well as with the outlying places of his own parish: he works on in one rut, and is too seldom wrenched out of it by outside influences.

One *alleviation* of course ought to be in our *Ruridecanal Chapters*. Well, there is difficulty even in this: the distances are great, the means of public conveyance not available, and perhaps the meeting not very interesting when you get there; and so it happens that such meeting loses half its beneficial effect from the absence of the very men who most need its influence.

Still, I am in duty bound to say, there *are* compensations to some of our disabilities and difficulties. We are saved from many of the worries and temptations of our brethren in the towns. We do our work in the pure air of heaven. Our very seclusion and difficulty of getting from home keeps us, at all events, on the spot and scene of our work. And though the dales parson may be sometimes tempted to think that he is shut out from all the stirring work which is going on for Christ in the busy city; that while the battle is raging in the front, he is useless in the rear; still he ought, I presume, to be content that, though in a remote corner, he is appointed by the Master to be there for a certain work, and though the post be obscure and insignificant, still the Master has graciously placed him there to keep it; and He bids him to be found watching, like a sentinel at an outpost—watching till the Captain comes.

(b.)—The DEAN OF RIPON.

THERE have been three stages in the progress of inland locomotion: first, during the last and the commencement of the present century, in the formation of canals (I believe there were only four canals in England previous to that period); secondly, the improvement of turnpike roads, about the year 1818, when the engineering skill of Telford and the simple invention of MacAdam introduced a new era in the history of road-making; and thirdly, the application of steam locomotive power to railways, in 1830.

In order to accomplish these great works a special class of labourers was required, for the ordinary agricultural labourer has not the qualifications for them until he has gone through the necessary training. Hence, as a demand will always command a supply, the men were found in the fens of Cambridgeshire and Lincolnshire, who were employed in the canals, where they were distinguished by the name of navigation men, which, being abbreviated, became navvy or navvies. And there we have the general title of that numerous body of men who are employed in works of the greatest difficulty and danger, requiring all the physical strength, courage, energy, and perseverance which can be found in the human frame. These works comprise not only canals, but all the heavy earth-

moving and excavations connected with embankments, cuttings, viaducts, and tunnels or railways, and on the drains and reservoirs connected with the sanitary arrangements, the sewerage, the supply of water and gas in our principal cities, and in the formation of docks, piers, and breakwaters in the various harbours of our sea-girt isle. When, therefore, a contractor undertakes a great work of this description, he must find men who have been trained to very hard and rough labour, who possess physical qualities of health, muscular strength and endurance, who will not be afraid of exposure to inclement weather when they are at their work, or of inhabiting a hut or shanty on some moor or mountain side far away from the comforts of social life. Take, for example, the following extract from the interesting life of Mr. Brassey :—"The labour which a navvy performs exceeds in severity almost any other description of work. A full day's work consists of fourteen sets a day; a set is a number of wagons—in fact a train. There are two men to a wagon. If a wagon goes out fourteen times, each man has to fill seven wagons in the course of the day. Each wagon contains two-and-a-quarter cubic yards. The result is that each man has to lift nearly twenty tons weight of earth on a shovel over his head into a wagon. The height of the lifting is about six feet. This is taking it at fourteen sets a day; but the navvies sometimes contrive to get through sixteen sets, and there are some men who will accomplish that astonishing quantity of work by three or four o'clock in the afternoon, a result I believe which is not nearly equalled by the workmen of any other country in the world."

Nor is this all. It requires very considerable courage to undertake the risks involved in undermining the earth in cuttings and in the construction of tunnels. The man has to labour often with his clothes saturated with water, and he has to breathe a most oppressive atmosphere. He works in a space which is temporarily shored up by timber, and the pressure of the earth is constantly putting the timber structure to a great strain. At times you hear alarming creaking noises round you, the earth threatening to come in and overwhelm the labourers. If they shrank from facing the danger the works could not be proceeded with. Passengers in their easy seats little think as they glide through a tunnel or a deep cutting how many lives have been sacrificed, and how many anxious hours of toil have been spent in providing this rapid and luxurious means of making their journey from place to place.

The selection and collecting together such bodies of men as I have described into the localities where they are engaged in work, presents a very serious consideration to the mind of those who have any concern for the moral and religious welfare of the men, as well as of those in whose immediate neighbourhood they take up their temporary abode. They are an exceptional class, not of one blood as the gipsies, or of one inheritance as the fisherman and sailor population; but they are gathered out of all ranks and conditions of society; strangers among strangers; to a great extent strangers among themselves. Hence it is that a navvy is rarely known except by a nick-name. He is a "curly," or a "slen," or a

“ Somerset,” or a “ King David,” because his hair, or his frame, or his native county, or his talent for singing have supplied a title by which he is universally designated upon the works. They rarely lodge in the towns and villages, but in huts and buildings near their work, wherever it may be. Thus they live in their own villages, separated from the ordinary influences of a town or rural population ; and they consider themselves to be in a sort of Edomite relation to all around them : their hands against every man, and every man’s hand against them. This class-prejudice naturally produces the worst results. Navvies are looked upon with suspicion, and are treated as if they were the wildest and the worst of beings,—the poachers, the drunkards, the sabbath breakers, the brawlers and blasphemers, the adulterers and heathen of the district. Thus a bad name is given to them, which they reciprocate and keep themselves to themselves. Thus they are, morally speaking, a very neglected class. I have the evidence of one man who said he had been 20 years a navvy and had been in many parts of England, but never once had a clergyman shown the slightest interest in him until he came into Yorkshire.

Another, in reply to a question about the condition of navvies, said:—

“ Well, sir ! I’ve been at this job a good bit now, and I’ve been up and down and all over, and have seen a deal, and I’ll just tell you how it is. Decent people, those who live in towns and villages, and have homes of their own and no occasion to tramp, they get a notion into their heads that we belong to a different breed from what they do. They reckon us a sort of big strong beasts, very useful in our way, but terrible dangerous, and not of much account except for strength. Why it was only the other day as I heard a woman telling about a railway accident, and she said as there was three men killed and a navvy. That’s the way, sir. We ain’t men at all—we ain’t got no feelings, nor no soul nor no nothing, but just strong backs and arms, and a big swallow for beer. It makes me laugh sometimes does folk’s ignorance ; but it’s a sad job too. It’s a very bad job, for it’s the spoiling of many a young fellow as might be kept straight with just a little kindness.” The story is told of a woman meeting a navvy in a narrow lane ; she instinctively passed to the other side to get out of his way, upon which the navvy said to her, “ You need not be afeared, ma’am ; my mother was a *woman*.” It would be difficult to state accurately the number of navvies actually employed in different parts of England. It has been estimated at 50,000 or 60,000, in gangs varying from 50 to 2000. We have a list of 60 places in which works are going on, in which 25,000 are employed. Now let us imagine the effect which the announcement would have in a country parish that a new line of railway, or that a series of reservoirs were about to be commenced, and that 3000 or 4000 navvies would be huttred in the immediate neighbourhood, for four or five years or more. The advantages of a railway and the probable expenditure of a considerable sum of money in the parish would be regarded with great satisfaction by the shop-keepers, the public-house and beershop

interest; but the religious and respectable people look at it with alarm and anxiety. A motley assemblage of strange and independent residents would be thrown upon them without any provision whatever for school or church accomodation, no clergyman, or scripture reader or schoolmaster. Twenty years ago, when the line from Leeds to the North was making, over 200 navvies were huddled in a field near a village. The villagers were so alarmed at the presence of these strangers that they would hold no communication with them, and an extra force of police armed with cutlasses was put on to patrol the place, and this went on for three years; the only restraint being the hours in which they are engaged at their work. It may be said that an influx of people like this should call forth an extraordinary effort on the part of the clergyman or ministers of religion in the parish; but this is not always possible or easily arranged, and practically the result is that little or no effort is made at all. We have a list of 60 places in which great works are going on at the present moment, out of which 49 are untouched by any religious influence; and if this has been the proportion in the past, when we contemplate the 15,000 miles of railway which have been made and the many other gigantic works which have been completed, we may review with much sorrow and searching of heart the amount of immorality and intemperance and violence which has been eating like a canker into a very large portion of the population in some of our most quiet and secluded districts. Nor is this large number of navvies likely to diminish. It may be said that our great trunk lines are now made and that the same amount of labour will not in future be required; but while new works are entered upon continually, and some of them upon a larger scale than any that have preceded them, such, for example, as the tunneling from Dover to Calais or the providing of the water supply for Manchester from Thirlmere Lake; and we must remember how many gangs of skilled navvies are required to keep the permanent way of railways in repair and to enlarge and improve the additional lines, the goods stations and sidings; so that we may expect the demand for labourers will continually increase.

It will be asked,—What can the Church do to meet the wants of a class which is not stationary and which is made up of men who are constantly, as they speak, on the tramp—that is, wandering from place to place and from one work to another? I answer, much every way. Thanks to the existence of our parochial system, there is always an organization, which, if properly informed and influenced, can supply all that is needed for the spiritual instruction of the navvy. Thus, for example, there is the Bishop of Peterborough's mission on the Manton and Kettering railway. There three mission chapels have been built and a clergyman and scripture reader appointed specially for the men. The Leicester and Newark railway is another case in which all needed work has been provided out of local resources. Amidst many of a similar nature I might mention my own experience in a country parish when the Buckinghamshire line was made, in 1845. By the liberal aid of the company and of the contractor, the late Mr. Brassey, three scripture readers were em-

ployed under the superintendence of the clergyman of the parish. When the line was completed, Mr. Brassey invited the officials to a dinner, and among the toasts proposed was the health of the chaplain: before he returned thanks, the chaplain begged Mr. Brassey to state whether upon the whole he felt satisfied that the religious instruction given to the men had produced any practical result. Mr. Brassey rose at once and said that he was not only satisfied, but he had pleasure in stating publicly that no money which he had laid out upon the railway had made him so good a return as that which had been spent upon the scripture readers. He alluded especially to the fact that the men returned to their work on the Monday, and there was less time spent in the public-houses. The information from the secretary of the Mission to Navvies (lately established under the patronage of the Bishop of Ripon) proves that while clergy and laity in the various localities where navvies are employed are anxious to do something for them, they do not know how to set about it. They want some itinerant secretary to visit them, and supply the counsels which experience in the work has tested. Thus, for example, it is a very common opinion that if only some kind of religious service can be provided, all has been done that need be done. It would seem to be a paradox, and almost a heresy to say so, but in dealing with a navvy settlement—say of 1,500 or 2,000 men and women—it would seem that a religious service is not the first thing that should be attempted, but perhaps the last in order,—not that it is the least important, but because unless some means are first used to teach the men to desire and appreciate a religious service, it is likely to be offered to them in vain. It should in fact come last, as highest in a series of steps, such as night school, reading room, adult Sunday school, or Bible class. In places where navvies lodge in or near a town, the mere provision of a comfortable room for their use in the evening, with attractive reading, refreshment, and, if possible, some instruction, would be the means of preventing much evil, and of humanizing many who are in danger of becoming hopelessly brutalized, and to lead the men either to attend the neighbouring churches, or to welcome any proposal to give them a service to themselves. In other places, remote from church or school, more complete provision is needed. I conclude this too rapid sketch with one or two practical suggestions as to what should and what can be done for the navvy settlement, wherever it may be. First.—A comfortable room should be provided well within reach of the huts or houses of the men: it should be divided into two parts by a moveable partition, each having a good stove. The one half should be used for reading, amusement, games, smoking, and papers and periodicals: in the other half a night school should be held regularly. On Sundays the whole room should be thrown into one and used as a Sunday school, with a Bible class for men, and a second men's class where they may learn to read; the rest of the school for children. This should be followed by a hearty service, with three hymns at least, but quite plain and simple; they require teaching and sympathy, not preaching at. The most good is generally done in the Sunday school and night school; a day school for the children is

very necessary, and a good lending library. In Scotland, the Postmaster-General has arranged that when he is applied to, a Branch Post-Office Savings Bank shall be opened on the pay-day at any works, and no doubt he would do the same in England. Personal visits to the huts, lending tracts and books, visiting the sick, writing a letter, executing a commission, and any other acts of kindness which involve regular and systematic effort (*not money gifts*) will be much appreciated: but, as I have said, the backbone of successful work, under God's blessing, is the night school, the amusement room, and the Sunday school.

The Navy Mission Society has now organized a quarterly letter, which is sent every quarter to all the works in which members of the Christian Union are located:—7,000 copies were sent out in August last, and have been eagerly received. At Fairlie, in Ayrshire, the first navy shelter or amusement room was opened in February last, for about 300 men employed upon a new line of railway. The success of this first effort led to the opening of a night school in September last, when 60 men entered their names as scholars, 10 volunteered as teachers,—nine of whom are working navvies. The subjects taught are arithmetic up to algebra, geography, euclid, reading, and writing. The men drew up their own rules, and the school is self-supporting. On five pay-days the sum of £86 has been paid into the Post-Office Savings Bank, the Postmaster attending to receive it. But I have said enough. The navy has strong claims upon our interest. The navy has been the pioneer of the great advance of civilization which has been the result of the wonderful engineering discoveries of this century. The navy has greatly altered the face of the country and the condition of many localities, which but for the railroad would be behind the age. The navy has constructed all the appliances for the convenience and comfort of our dwelling-houses, in drainage, and sewerage, and water supply, and every other sanitary requirement. All this good he has done; but, alas! in the doing of it he has done much more harm, which would never have been done if it had not been forgotten by those who were reaping the benefit of his labour, that these poor navvies had human hearts and immortal souls as well as muscular frames and sinewy arms. The time is come when the heart of English Christians is moved to care for them, and we trust the Congress at Sheffield will gain another blessing to the many which it will have from these discussions, in promoting the cause of Christ amongst this long neglected but most important class of operatives.

ADDRESSES.

(a.)—The LORD BISHOP of CARLISLE.

IT is my duty to lead you back for a short time from the work of the navvies to the mountains and the moors. Perhaps I should do well if I commence the remarks I have to make by saying how deeply I sympathise with the right rev. chairman in his observations on the subject of area, and the necessity of considering area as well as the amount of population in respect to the work and difficulties of the clergy. I sympathise with him too as to the difficulty of finding suitable persons to take the charge of souls in these scattered places; though I am bound to quote on the other side an experience of my own, when, through the kindness of the newspapers in making it known that I required an incumbent for one of these small out-of-the-way parishes, I received the names of no less than seventy clergymen who were willing to accept it. I sympathise also with what Canon Boyd has said about the difficulty of getting meetings together to be addressed by deputations; and although I bear him a grudge for taking so much of the ground I would have occupied, I will make him a present of a story on the subject by way of illustration. He spoke of deputations meeting eight or ten wet children in a damp school-room; and I remember on one occasion one of my clergy who was about to hold a meeting more or less of this kind, having to go some distance to meet the deputation. He had never seen the deputation, and the deputation had never seen him, and my friend the pastor thought the best way of securing recognition was to sit down on the road by the side of a lake, which he had to cross, and sing at the top of his voice, which was a very strong one, "From Greenland's icy mountains." Presently a gentleman in black appeared—approached him and said, "You must be the incumbent of such a parish;" and he replied "Yes, I am, and you must be S. P. G.;" and that was the way in which the junction between the two was effected. Then I agree with the suggestion of licensing suitable schoolmasters as assistants to the clergyman. Indeed I have already done so; in one case with great satisfaction; and there are I think many cases in which the operation might prove successful. I am sure, I may say, that there will not be any difficulty raised by the bishops. One word more as to the remarks of Canon Boyd on the intellects of clergymen in remote districts becoming stagnant. When he wishes that idea to be received he had better keep himself in the background, as it is quite obvious that this isolation has had no such effect upon him. I will now make one or two remarks on my own account. The subject divides itself into two parts,—first the sheep, and then the shepherds. The sheep in question do not much differ from other sheep; only mountain sheep are liable to be rather wild. Moreover there is not much wool to be got off them; and those who go to look after them must do it chiefly from love of the sheep. There is after all not much difference in the sheep; the great distinction is in the shepherds; and the problem to be solved is a difficult one. They have first to catch the sheep, which are very wild. They cannot send dogs after them, because, to say nothing of the danger of tearing them, as a matter of fact they have no dogs. If these sparse populations are to be dealt with, it must be by individual communication with them at their own homes and by speaking to them in private. In large parishes where you can have grand churches and ornate services, there is something which in a certain way appeals to every man on behalf of God; but it is not so with a mountain chapel. If we want to influence a mountaineer we must go to him at his own home and speak to him there. Locomotion, therefore, becomes an important matter. When I

was at the Church Congress at Stoke-upon-Trent, I ventured to suggest that a strong pony was one of the best curates a clergyman in a mountainous district could have. I still entertain that opinion, and I was sorry to hear Canon Boyd say there were clergy too poor to keep a pony. I will tell you another story with reference to this suggestion. Some time ago a miner in Derbyshire, who had read what I said about ponies, went and bought a small pony and a cart, and drove in it to the clergyman's house. He said, "I know you cannot afford to keep a horse; I can, and if you will allow me I will, drive you to any part of your parish to which you want to go." Well, that is a practical way of carrying out what we sometimes call the co-operation of the laity. With regard to the clergy of our mountains and dales, there is no doubt a great change in the men who take these posts compared with what they were years ago. The character of the old mountain clergyman has been a good deal caricatured. I do not like the picture drawn by Lord Macaulay of the clergy of past times; it is to a great extent a caricature; and I do not think that even the mountain clergy were quite of the type attributed to them notably by a writer in the *Edinburgh Review*. There were clergymen in the olden days, as now, unworthy of their sacred profession; but there were others who were the centres of their parishes in all good works, and who were not only the clergyman, but the schoolmaster, the lawyer, and, not unfrequently, the "clogger" for the whole parish. I have heard friends of mine in the north speak in the highest terms of clergymen, who might sometimes be found in secluded dales, like "wonderful Mr. Walker," whose fame is recorded by Wordsworth. I should like to remind you that culture is not wholly wanting in our dales. Soon after I became Bishop of Carlisle, I was driving up the valley of the Duddin with the successor of "wonderful Walker," whose name curiously enough, was Walker too. He told me he had just been reading a play of Sophocles to see whether he had lost his Greek, and he was delighted to find that he could construe Sophocles nearly as well as he could years before at Oxford: so that you see we have *culture* in our dales. I will, however, tell you another story to show that some other qualities besides culture are requisite. A friend of mine went some years ago to a mountain chapel, in Cumberland. The clergyman took for his text that passage from the Acts of the Apostles in which is described the Ethiopian nobleman returning from Jerusalem, and reading in his chariot the book of Isaiah the prophet. He began by saying, "No doubt the question has already occurred to you, my brethren, whether the Ethiopian nobleman was reading the passage in the original Hebrew, or in the Septuagint translation." That is rather by the way. What I should like to impress upon you,—and this is the most serious part of the question—is that the clergy in our moors and dales do deserve your sympathy and your prayers. The position in which a man of education is placed in one of these remote parishes—a position over which (as we have seen to-day from the example of Canon Boyd) some have power to triumph—is still a most difficult and trying one. We ought to think and act very tenderly towards any of them, who may have fallen under these difficulties from the high moral position a clergyman ought to maintain. It is a sad thing for the parish—it is a sad thing for himself when this happens; everything that can be done by brotherly sympathy or by any other means to avert this terrible mischief ought certainly to be done. I have not time to pursue this subject: but before I conclude I should like to make a practical suggestion. It is that there should be established in scattered parishes what has been called an "Itinerating Library." The principle is, that the books should go to one parish and remain there as long as may be necessary, and then be passed on to the next parish. In this way a well-chosen selection of good literature may be made available at a small cost for the inhabitants of a number of scattered places. I believe that the plan has been tried in my own diocese with success.

In conclusion, reference was made this morning to an article in the current number of *The Nineteenth Century*, which spoke of a desire existing amongst some persons in the Church of England to forward the work of Disestablishment. I have nothing to do with the clergyman at St. Alban's, Holborn, from whom that paper emanates; and if he can disestablish St. Alban's, and get rid of the terrible yoke which he seems to feel so heavily, let him do so. But I earnestly beseech him, and all those who entertain similar views, to leave our moors and mountains alone. It may be in large towns that disestablishment would not be much felt; and some places might conceivably flourish all the more for disestablishment; but in our mountains, and dales, and moors, it would be simply destruction. I therefore appeal to all those who have strong views as to disestablishment to remember that there is another side to the question; and to leave our moors, mountains, and dales with the yoke of establishment upon them.

(b.)—The LORD BISHOP OF SODOR AND MAN.

THE subject on which I have to speak to you this afternoon is that of "navvies;" but as I am always glad to give currency to a good suggestion I will first say a few words in reference to a slip of paper which has been handed to me since I have been on this platform. I do not know who the writer is, but I hope his suggestion may prove useful. The Bishop of Carlisle has spoken of the great advantage it would be to those who work in moors and dales to have a pony each; but there is this disadvantage about a pony—it has to be fed. The slip of paper I hold in my hand suggests a pony that will do the work uncommonly well and does not require to be fed—the suggestion is, "Buy the curates a bicycle apiece."

The BISHOP OF CARLISLE.

BUT he won't go up hill!

The BISHOP OF SODOR AND MAN.

WELL, ladies and gentlemen, my recent experience in connection with navvies has been of such a peculiar character* that my friends have suggested that some one else should take my place on this occasion; but as I have for a long time taken the deepest interest in the work of the Church amongst the navvies I feel it impossible to be silent in this discussion. I will begin by telling you how I originally came to take an interest in this work. When I first decided to take holy orders, I did what I would advise every young man, with a similar intention, to do. I went to work for some months with a clergyman in his parish, so that I might become practically acquainted with parochial work before I took that office upon me. In the parish where my lot was cast, Christ Church, Dover, there was a large number of navvies employed on the Government works, and I had an opportunity of learning, not only what navvies were like, but also what could be done with that interesting class. I used to go up almost daily with the scripture reader, and while they were at their dinners I would stand up and speak simply to these men from the word of God. They always listened attentively, and sometimes would enter into conversation upon what they had heard. They asked interesting questions, and sometimes very funny ones. One day a navvy said to

* The bishop was assaulted by a navvy in the Isle of Man, who threw a stone at him which missed him, but injured Mrs. Hill, who sat next to him.

me, "Oh, master, here is Tim. He believes in purgatory. Tell him something about that." I said, of course, that there was no such place; upon which Tim rejoined, "Ah, jist wait till ye get there!" I mention that to show the kind of way in which they are ready to enter into any subjects put before them. They were never unwilling to listen; I found them from first to last a very interesting set of men; and from that time, as the opportunity presented, I have continued to do what I could for the navvies. Thus it happened, that when a number of them were brought over to construct the new line of railway in the Isle of Man, I at once engaged the services of an evangelist—which, I believe, is the first step in this important work—to labour amongst them. It has been suggested that this was perhaps the reason why the man who committed the outrage upon me acted as he did. From what the Dean of Ripon has said, you will have gathered that the navvy is a peculiar man, that he belongs to a peculiar class, and that he requires peculiar treatment. That is quite true. I remember in some of my dealings with the navvies, a mother came and claimed a navvy as her son, and his answer was, "She's no mother of mine; I never had none!" But the navvy is not always the son of a navvy. I stood by the deathbed of a navvy who told me the story of his life. He was the son of a gentleman, and had been at the University, but he had wasted all his substance in profligacy and vice, and was reduced for an existence to manual labour. I learnt to know him thoroughly, and I saw him pass into eternity with a firm trust in his God and Saviour, with Whom I believe he now is. Many navvies came from that part of Her Majesty's dominions that I came from, namely, Ireland, which, I am afraid, is not so well appreciated as it should be; but still it supplies a number of excellent workmen. These Irishmen, however, are rather difficult to deal with. Taking the navvies altogether, they form a class which has been very much overlooked and neglected; but it is a class which has strong claims upon us, as the constructors of all the great works in the kingdom. I do not know of any class which has greater claims upon us than they, and there is, therefore, every reason why we should do our best to advance their spiritual welfare. What then can be done? At Dover I heard a good deal about two people who had done much for them. One was Miss Marsh; they called her Lady Marsh. I have heard them say, "Ah! Lady Marsh; she *was* a woman; she did everything for us." But there was another person of whom they spoke gratefully; I am not sure now, but I believe his name was Poole. He had been a chemist in the South of England; but he became so deeply interested in this class of people that he gave up his business, and dressed and worked as a navvy, in order that he might the more effectually carry on mission work among them. In that character that man did an immensity of good. This I know from the men themselves, and I saw the result in many hearts and lives being given to the Saviour, Whom they had learned to love. The question before us is, "How is the Church to carry out this work?" It naturally suggests itself that the contractors should be the people to take it in hand; but (although there are bright examples, such as Mr. Brassey and Mr. Jackson, who pay for missionary work amongst their navvies,) the contractor as a rule will not do anything—he is contracted in his feelings, and that is perhaps the reason he is so named. Another difficulty arises from the nomadic character of these men, who are always moving about. It is all very well to say the clergyman should take them in hand when they come into his parish, but their labour is usually completed before the clergyman has got his plans for dealing with them in order. In the Isle of Man there is great difficulty in getting men for this kind of mission work—we are *under-manned* there. But yet in spite of all these difficulties the Church must do something for a class of men who are doing so much for the benefit of the country. There are three ways in which the mission work amongst them can be best carried forward: first, sympathy must

be shown to them. The clergyman must go amongst them; deal with them individually; and show that he considers them of his own flesh and blood. They are men who do not care for starch; they must be taken by the hand and must see that a real interest is felt for their spiritual welfare. Next to the clergyman himself, the labours of an evangelist are needed at the beginning in dealing with this class—one with the love of God in his heart and the word of God on his lips—dealing with each individual case, and by persuasive loving means bringing them to know the truth of the gospel. In a little time the next step will be to supply a mission room; and in that there must be tea and coffee provided. One of the greatest curses to the navy is drink, and another curse is gambling. With tea and coffee, therefore, there should also be innocent games, so that they may not be tempted to have recourse to gambling and drinking, for recreation or indulgence. Of course there must be teaching and instruction classes in order to lead them on to the further and last step of coming to church. Some people think that navvies never go to church. I deny that in *toto*. If you teach the navy the value of the Church he will be there as well as anybody else, and he will come as well-dressed as other people to the house of God. Thus leading him from the works in which he is engaged to the mission house, and from thence to the church, you will find that he will become a devoted member of the Church of England, but better still, a living member of the Church of God.

(b.)—Rev. J. McCORMICK.

At the Stoke Congress public attention was called to the general condition of our important and, comparatively speaking, neglected canal and barge population. I know not whether the statements made at the Congress in any degree influenced legislation, but, as a matter of fact, in the subsequent year the talented and indefatigable Home Secretary of the present Government, carrying out a splendid policy for the benefit of the working classes, introduced and passed through the House of Commons the short but useful bill, entitled the Canal Boats Act. It was notorious that there were no official regulations with reference to canal boats; that they were often over-crowded; that in many cases their sanitary condition was disgraceful; that little or no care was taken to keep them free from infectious diseases; and that the education of the children was, as a rule, utterly neglected. The Act of 1877, which came into force in January of the present year, aims at effecting beneficial reforms in each of these particulars. But there is a danger of the Act becoming a dead letter. Local authorities may—and there are signs that, if possible, they will—ignore its existence. Those authorities may be owners of boats; or the influence of owners, who are to some extent pecuniarily affected by the Act, may be brought to bear upon them, and obvious duty may be neglected. The public must demand, and the Church of England, which should ever be in the van of all true progress, must demand, that the provisions of the Act be loyally carried out. Those noble societies, which deserve more liberal and generous support than they receive, which are organising mission work amongst the canal and barge populations—I mean the Seamen's Mission, the Church Pastoral Aid and the Additional Curates Societies—will, I trust, instruct their agents in their several districts to take all legitimate steps for the due administration of so wise and beneficial a measure. About the time of the passing of the Act a series of most interesting articles appeared in the *Standard* newspaper, bearing upon the condition and habits of the canal and barge population, and upon the prospect of reformation which the Act, not then in force, would be likely to effect. The writer

called himself a "special commissioner." He informed the public that he had taken a long journey in an ordinary canal boat, and that he had visited some of the stations at which numbers of boats congregated. From all that he said the conclusion may be drawn that the Act has not been passed one day too soon, and that many, both of the owners of boats and of those who manage them, are willing, if not anxious, that its provisions should be carried out. It may be well to refer to his observations on that aspect of his subject, which especially concerns this Congress.

"I am satisfied," he says, "that the local authorities in carrying out the provisions of the Act will have to exercise extreme caution in dealing with any clause affecting the women. When I say women, I am alluding more particularly to the mothers of the children who next year will come under the cognisance of various local school boards. I was talking yesterday to a clergyman of a parish abutting on a certain section of the Grand Junction Canal. He gave me instances of the great difficulty that had been experienced by the guardians of the poor in his district in reaching cases of wife desertion by the canal boatmen. He mentioned the case of a boatman's wife with six children, and all she received from her husband's wages was ten shillings a week. 'He stays away up in London,' said the clergyman, 'and we can't get hold of him.' The reverend gentleman whose words I am quoting had had some experience of the canal boatmen, their habits and mode of life. 'I think I may say as a rule,' he remarked, 'that their whole idea of life is eating, drinking, and smoking. They are utterly selfish; they spend all they can upon themselves. We got up a special Sunday afternoon service for them in the parish church here for a time, but they wouldn't attend it. They had no coats, they pleaded, and did not like coming to church in their sleeves; and the service was perforce dropped.' I am inclined to agree with the clergyman whose opinion of the bargemen I have already quoted that the men as a rule eat well, drink well, and smoke well. I may be permitted, perhaps, to add a few words on the religious aspect of the subject which has been engaging my attention for the past week. I am not prepared to admit that the barge people are more destitute of advantages in the way of spiritual education than are their fellow-labourers of the world in the Metropolitan, or, for the matter of that, any other district in the kingdom. The boatmen and their wives have churches and chapels to go to, if they will but go; and mission agents and other excellent men are always to be found willing to give them kindly advice and assistance. The fact is that, in my mind, it is just as useless trying to teach the Apaches the Chinese alphabet as endeavouring to bring the bargees to church, so long as their earnings depend in any way upon the quickness of the voyages they make. I am not referring now altogether to the great centres, or 'tying-up' places, but to the towns upon the canals generally. Pay the men weekly wages, and compel them to 'tie-up' on Sundays, and they will go to church and chapel the same, I take it, as other people. But a man must be able to withstand a great amount of temptation if he will sit in the church aisle in his work-a-day shirt or dirty jacket sleeves, in preference to adding a shilling or two to the miserable weekly wages of himself, wife, and little ones. I am putting the matter in my own fashion. I am compelled also to say, judging from personal observation, that many statements that have been made concerning the bargees are altogether overdrawn. In their habits and manner of life many of them are bad enough, but not so bad as they have been painted."

Even according to this "special commissioner's" experience, all bargees are not alike. The moral tone of those on one canal is much higher than that on another: the crew on board an ordinary canal boat is vastly superior to that which works a colliery barge. So that in the eyes of one religious agent this class of population is on a level with, if not superior to, the generality of English labourers: while another

estimates those who compose it as "a degraded set, whose God is their belly, and whose Bible is the *Police News*, and their Refuge is the public-house."

A distinction must also be made between the bargees who have houses and only partially live on the water, and those who dwell entirely on their boats. The former are much more civilized, and have many more opportunities of attending to religious duties than the latter. The fact is, the canal population is of a mixed character, good and bad, only the good are not very good and the bad are often very bad. In addition to the vices which are often prevalent amongst other labourers, many of the bargees are unfair, over-reaching, suspicious in their treatment of their brethren, and their language is abominable. As drinkers and fighters, the women can hold their own with the men. Their mode of living—husband, wife, and children crowded together in very small cabins—does not tend to decency or morality. But who is to blame for this state of things? What efforts have been made to reclaim the bargee? What influence has been brought to bear upon the women? What authority has been exercised or inducement held out to rescue the children from ignorance and vice? As far as the Church of England is concerned the answers to these questions are not very satisfactory. For years the canal and barge population has been, to a great extent, a neglected class. True there have been isolated cases of noble labour and self-denial on the part of laymen as well as clergymen, but they have been few, and connected with special localities. The good effected in one place has not been followed up in another. There has been no general systematic work, emanating from any central body, and carried out upon principles which would govern a special class of agents, and affect a population of 100,000 souls, scattered over upwards of 5,000 miles of navigable rivers and canals. A mission hall or church, a night school, a clerical agent, a Scripture-reader, a voluntary labourer here and there, has redeemed the Church from absolute neglect. In many a large town, or "tying-up" place, there has been no Church agency at work at all. Take, for example, the great sea-port with which I am connected. It is calculated that there are about 6,600 barges, keels, and smacks, with a population of about 22,000, annually entering the port of Hull. The Church's work amongst this large number of human beings is only of an indirect character. True, we have a Mariners' Church, with an earnest pastor, a reading-room, and an efficient and devoted Scripture-reader; true, some of the bargees are reached through the ordinary parochial ministrations; but all these agencies are almost exclusively occupied in attempting to be of some service to the 60,000 sailors who work our steamers and large sailing vessels. This is a very humiliating statement to have to make, but I have little doubt that it is a statement equally applicable to other places as well as Hull. I may, perhaps, be allowed to add that in conjunction with the Seamen's Missions Society we have devised a scheme which, when carried out, will remove this terrible reproach. It would be very unfair to blame the parochial clergy for the unsatisfactory condition of the canal and barge population. Many of them, with all the machinery they can set in motion, have far more work than they can possibly accomplish. Moreover, this extra-parochial class requires, in my opinion, a special and peculiar agency. An hour or two snatched from regular ministrations; a hurry-scurry visit to one or more barges once or twice a week; ignorance about the vices or virtues, the habits and ordinary duties of the bargees, or even about the appointments of the boats themselves; an attempt to jumble up in the same effort sailors who have their own idiosyncracies and bargees who have theirs, will not do. The work is a peculiar work, and only those who are qualified for it should undertake it; and it is so vast, and has so many ramifications, that the whole of the agent's time and energies should be devoted to it. Think of the judgment to be exercised in order to speak to the bargees at the precise time when they are likely to give attention to what is said; think of the twenty minutes or half-an-hour to be spent in

waiting to board a boat ; think of the special interest to be taken in the men and their families, sometimes in finding work for idle hands, often in procuring a cargo from a merchant, in seeing that the children go to school, in carrying on a correspondence for them and about them with their relatives and those who are likely to do them good ; think of the care to be taken in selecting, giving or lending useful books for their instruction or recreation in their long hours of idleness ; think of the absolute necessity of personal dealing with individual men ; think of the class of addresses to be delivered before this peculiar population, and you will agree with me that the remnant of any clergyman's or lay agent's time would be utterly inadequate in such a case. There never was a more suitable opportunity than there is now for organising a special mission for the benefit of the canal and barge population. The new Act will be of incalculable service. The work already accomplished, desultory and isolated though it has frequently been, has been of the most interesting character. There has been a perceptible decrease in drunkenness, I am credibly informed, through the temperance movement, and especially through the establishment at some of the " tying-up " places of coffee-houses. Many of the women wish to leave the barges, and have homes of their own on shore. The bargees, who are very ill-educated, and are conscious of their own deficiencies, are anxious that their children should attend school. There is no hostility to religious influences. I learn from more quarters than one, that those who are labouring amongst the bargees and their families receive the greatest encouragement, so that they thoroughly delight in their work. The fields are already white to the harvest. Let the Church step in on a well-arranged plan, and, in the name of the Lord of the harvest, reap the precious golden grain.

DISCUSSION.

Rev. S. ANDREW, Vicar of Tideswell, and Rural Dean of Eyam,
Derbyshire.

AFTER an experience of twenty-five years in the promotion of mission churches and schools, I wish to say a few words, which I hope will have a practical tendency, with regard to this subject. Of all the questions raised by the programme of this Congress, I do not know one of greater importance than that we are considering this afternoon. I had the honour of advocating the claims of the Additional Curates' Aid Society before the Bishop of Lincoln in that city, and in my address I made some remarks in reference to the condition of our country parishes ; and the bishop was pleased to say he was struck with them, and added that the success of our institutions, and even the monarchy itself, depended upon the manner in which the nation discharged its duty to the country parishes of England. There are four things required in reference to the extension of the Church in country places. The first is an inquiry into the matter—not a Parliamentary inquiry—but an inquiry in every diocese, in every rural deanery, and in every parish, and I think this should be conducted under the bishop's special direction. The late Bishop Selwyn, whose name will be received with reverence in all assemblies of Churchmen, visited every rural deanery in his large diocese, in order to form conferences of clergy and laity. It is the duty of a bishop, like that of a general, to place his men and station them for attack or defence in every part of the field over which he has to direct operations ; and that this may be well and thoroughly done, such an inquiry as I have suggested is necessary. The second point is the importance of providing for the clergy ready access to information in reference to the best plans for forming mission

churches and mission stations in their parishes. It should be easy for them to inspect plans and to ascertain the most approved means of raising money, and also the best ways of maintaining hamlet chapels and schools—a subject which requires more careful consideration, I imagine, than has been given to it to-day. Then every incumbent who takes upon himself the responsibility of extending the boundaries of the Church ought to be in communication with the bishop as to the future, that is, as to whether the extension is to form a separate district or be worked in connection with the parish church. I remember some years ago the late Bishop of Lichfield expressing an opinion that scattered hamlets should not be divided into separate incumbencies, but worked in connection with the mother church. Incumbents who are taking this work in hand would be glad of information with respect to plans for buildings as well as organisation. We all remember the efforts lately made at Barrow-in-Furness, and the noble exertions of the Duke of Devonshire and other gentlemen, who took great interest in making such a provision, and I would earnestly urge that example upon those connected with country parishes in which the spiritual provision is inadequate. Reference has sometimes been made to old traditions of people getting ready their market carts to go to their parish church; but that practice is fast going, if not already gone, and it is high time the Church supplied something in its place. Thirdly, information is needed by incumbents as to what are fair and just building charges. I have had a great deal to do with these things, and I remember once having two estimates for the same work, one of which was £481, and the other £736; and it turned out that the lesser was from the more experienced builder, and resulted in an excellent building. It is evident, then, that much money may be wasted if a clergyman gets into wrong hands. The sites for school churches ought to be conveyed to a diocesan trust, such as exists in the diocese of Lichfield. Then a question may arise whether there shall be one mission room or two. The instruction required by the inhabitants of many of these hamlets extends from their youth to their age, and it is therefore important to have the means of adapting that instruction to different periods of life. Dean Colet—a man before his age in many respects—when he founded the noble school of St. Paul's, in London, had the school chapel going out from the school at right angles, yet joined with the school; and I have found that a good plan in hamlets, because there are festival times, when it is necessary to make provision for larger assemblies of the people than at ordinary times. Fourthly, the question of maintenance must be considered. It divides itself into two parts—ordinary expenses, and the maintenance of the living agency to do the work. I am inclined to think that the incumbent himself should visit his hamlet congregation once a week, and preach at least once a month, or, better still, once a week. He will probably have a curate in charge, but he should be there frequently himself; and he will find great advantage in the employment of lay deacons. We have a plan in the diocese of Lichfield under which all the lay deacons go twice a year to Lichfield to be examined. I wish I had time to explain the working of the probationer system, as we call it, in the diocese of Lichfield. The Additional Curates' Aid Society, the Pastoral Aid Society, and other societies should be willing to give permanent help to those clergy who are enlarging in this way the boundaries of the church; and as such incumbents undertake a heavy responsibility, they should be aided by the Church generally. If ladies and gentlemen would devote money to this purpose they would see a greater return for their benevolence than by any other expenditure whatever. With regard to the societies formed to assist such enterprises, it would be well if there were less red tape and more real help.

F. S. POWELL, Esq., late M.P. for the West-Riding.

I HAVE some reluctance to occupy a moment of your time at this late hour of the afternoon, and I probably should not have done so had not allusions been made to the Additional Curates' Aid Society and the Pastoral Aid Society. As one of the committee of the former, on whom devolves that invidious and difficult duty of considering the demands of applicants and of assigning the grants, it is due to that society that I should say a few words. Some years ago there was a list of not less than 500 applicants to whom they had to send negative replies. That list has now been reduced to manageable proportions. It has been hinted that too much regard is paid to mere numbers, and that we ought to take area and extent more into consideration. If any who thus think had the good fortune to attend our consultations, they would see the extreme difficulty in which we should often be placed by that consideration. We may have, for instance, to deal with an application from a vast town, with an overpowering population, so concentrated that by aiding the clergy with £50 or £60 we may bring 5000 or 6000 people within the sound of the gospel; but if we make a like grant in a remote district, all we do is to bring within the fold 500 or 600 people, if so many. And so it comes that the larger number of our grants go to these vast, these overwhelming, I may say these crushing populations. It is sometimes said that these great towns need no help, because they are abounding in wealth; but although that is true, the wealth is too frequently *not* in the hands of churchmen. The large establishments and the palatial mansions which we see in these large towns do not measure the amount which might be given to the Church; but they are the exact measure of the subscriptions to the Liberation Society. When on the other hand we are dealing with the country, the lands are still in the hands of Churchpeople; and therefore it is incumbent upon those who live in the rural districts to extend a helping hand to their poorer and spiritually less fortunate neighbours. I have not a word to say in disparagement of the manufacturing districts; but I think it is a great mistake to be constantly drawing comparisons between town and country, to the discredit of the latter. I will mention two facts which may furnish an illustration of the real state of the case. It is generally supposed that the best educated boys come from the towns; but on inquiring some time since at a meeting of teachers—than whom none were more competent to form a judgment—I was informed by a teacher, who spoke with the assent of his colleagues, that boys from the country are better educated, while those from the town are “up to more mischief.” A clergyman, who is an inspector of schools, recently went on a tour of inspection, and to his great astonishment found the religious knowledge of the children in the remote vales of North Yorkshire was superior to that which he found in children of town districts. And although my own lot is cast amidst the smoke of large towns, I do not like to hear remarks to the disparagement of the rural districts. With regard to the canal population, I believe the statements respecting it are grossly exaggerated. Three or four years ago a Royal Commission examined into the matter, and when subjected to the sobering and responsible effects of examination before such an authority, the sensational parts of those statements were omitted. Much has now been done to produce a reform in this population. Every child on board canal boats must henceforth attend school, and eventually the civilising and christianising influences of education and religion will be felt in their homes. In the meantime let us treat these migratory classes as brethren, and not as foreigners and barbarians. I would rather consider them, if such a term be permitted, as tourists for hire.

They are working men like other working men, but living under conditions somewhat disadvantageous as compared with their fellow-labourers. Let us put forth every exertion for their welfare, and render them, in an increasing degree, a population of which we may with justice and reason feel proud.

REV. ISHMAEL FISH, Vicar of Huttons Ambo.

I SHOULD like to make two purely practical suggestions on the very interesting subject of dealing with navvies; but before doing so I wish to modify the impression made upon the meeting by what has been said by the Dean of Ripon and the Bishop of Sodor and Man with reference to the religious instruction and attention given to the navy class in years gone by. If the impression be that such examples as those brought before you by the Dean and Bishop are rare examples, then that is a mistake. It is now nearly 32 years since I received a commission from two gentlemen in a breakfast-room in London to come into Yorkshire and make the numbers and moral condition of the men employed in the construction of railways in the county a special subject of enquiry. This commission led me over the whole area of Yorkshire; the works at that time going on being, among many others, the great tunnels at Bramhope, Idle, Burdale and Woolley. Here is an instance of the kind of circumstance I met. In one district extending over 20 miles on the east side of the county were 1,400 men with their wives and children, forming an aggregate population of 3,000 souls; they were located within three miles of the line on either side; within that area were 10 parish churches but only two resident clergymen, and at the point where the greatest colony of navvies was planted there was a service in church only once in six weeks. At that very place I afterwards organized a navy mission, which was maintained until the works were completed, a period of more than five years, and I can testify that the teaching of the gospel of God led to a great improvement in the habits of the people, and in not a few instances, as I believe, to the saving of their souls. The two gentlemen who gave me the commission I have named were Mr. (now Sir Morton) Peto, and the late Rev. Wm. Brock, minister of Bloomsbury Chapel, who, it must be granted, though they were Dissenters, did a great work for God both in this country and abroad among men employed on public works. The particular mission I have alluded to was organized and maintained at the instance of the late Lord Morpeth, then M.P. for the West Riding and one of Her Majesty's Ministers of State. I could name other instances of spiritual work of the same kind did time permit, but I think this may serve to remove somewhat of the opprobrium that might seem to lie against the Church and her philanthropists with respect to the spiritual wants of navvies. What the Church could do now in the locality I have described may be judged when I state that within the same area there are now 11 churches, all of which are open at least every Sunday for worship, and there are 12 resident clergymen.

Now for my two suggestions. In the first place let the parish priest, who by the law of the Church is responsible before God for the souls of all who reside within his parish, undertake this work. I do not depreciate the work of lay evangelists, but the first and best evangelist for the navy is the clergyman. Secondly, let him go to the navy, not as to a man of a different class from the rest of his labouring parishioners, but as to a man in different circumstances,—let him offer in a frank and kindly manner the instruction, the comfort, the consolation, the precious blessings which the Church of England has to offer, and he will find the navy willing to receive his ministry and thankful for it.

The CHAIRMAN.

I AM sorry there is no time for any more speeches, but before closing the meeting I will read a note placed in my hands by the Bishop of Lichfield, who had intended to speak but who has been obliged to leave.

"Would you kindly mention that Bishop Selwyn had taken steps towards a special barge mission on the canals in his diocese, and had a barge built for this purpose, and a committee of clergymen had been formed of old University oars to consult with him and consider what had best be done towards carrying on this work."

WEDNESDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 2nd, 1878.

The BISHOP OF RIPON presided at the commencement, but afterwards His Grace the PRESIDENT took the chair.

THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH IN RELATION TO
INTEMPERANCE.

The CHAIRMAN.

I HAVE to announce that His Grace the President is within the building, but is specially engaged at present and has requested me to open the meeting.

PAPERS.

His Worship the MAYOR OF SHEFFIELD (F. T. Mappin, Esq.)

AFTER receiving the invitation to read a paper upon the duty of the Church in relation to intemperance, I decided in my own mind to decline doing so, being aware of my inability to prepare one sufficiently interesting on that important subject. My official position as mayor of this town induced me, however, to change my decision, considering that what I might say would be read by the people in this locality, and my opinions might be of some service to them. For this reason I must ask you to pardon and excuse what I have written, if not interesting to you.

There is no subject of greater importance to the welfare and happiness of this country than the one before us. It is admitted by all classes intemperance is a blot and a stain upon our people's character; it is, therefore, not necessary for me to offer many arguments to prove it, but I take for granted we all believe it is one of the greatest curses with which this country is afflicted.

During the last thirty or forty years there has been less of the gross indulgence in this degrading vice than previously. The upper and better-educated classes of society have been convinced and have seen the necessity of drinking less alcohol. Their health is improved, and their happiness is in every way promoted by this course of living, and the drunkard has become the exception

amongst them; at the beginning of the century the case was precisely the reverse. Now shopkeepers and skilled labourers have learned from the example of their superiors; the drunkard is found lower down in the social scale; the lust for liquor is an animal taste, and is most strong in the lowest and most brutal natures. This change for the better is having considerable influence, and together with the efforts made by so many Christian Churches who are sending out lecturers, establishing temperance and other societies, their efforts have been greatly blessed with success. Yet we all admit the process towards what we desire is a slow one; and let me ask you, what are we Church men and women doing to mitigate, to decrease, to exterminate this disgraceful habit, this liking for strong drink, which fills our workhouses, our lunatic asylums, and our prisons; which makes the houses of the people wretched and miserable? Are we, I say, doing our duty in this great and all-important work; are the clergy startling the people and telling them of their great sin in leading this their wretched life? Oh, that some great and powerful Churchman would take this matter up, devote himself to it, and tell the people of England what they are doing, how they are degrading themselves and their country by their habits of intemperance! Are we to go on from year to year as we have done so long, until we cease to be shocked at it? Surely it is high time the Christian heart of England should arouse itself and say we will not permit this vice any longer to prey upon the people. We are told by the Inland Revenue Office that during the first six months this year they received duties upon the following quantities of spirits:—

						Gallons.
For Home-made Spirits	..	..	..	..	..	14,004,298
Foreign Spirits imported	..	..	..	..	..	5,037,711
						Gallons .. 19,042,009

Even this immense quantity was less by 641,838 gallons than what they had entered in the corresponding half of 1877. Can we contemplate the quantity of spirits (or I should say poison) that is consumed by a section of our people? And the amount in money expended is £140,000,000 per year. It is time the Church should take this evil more energetically in hand: all of us, high and low, rich and poor, must aid and assist in reducing it. You may say the Church is at work in this matter. True, no doubt; but what is now doing will not suffice; a marked and great effort must be made. Why, let me ask, have we so rarely sermons on temperance preached in our Churches? Two or three weeks back the Rev. W. Barker, from Cowes, preached two sermons on this all-important subject in Sheffield, in our churches, which produced a great effect upon his hearers. If in every church and chapel in this diocese a sermon on temperance was delivered every three months, it would be a great blessing and a benefit to the people, by calling their attention, and, I hope in time, convincing them of the evils of intemperance.

The influence of the Church can be applied by the vicar of every

parish, stating and feeling it is his duty to provide, by some means or other, a suitable place, where his parishioners can meet each other, read the newspapers, talk over the current events and the affairs of the country, smoke their tobacco, without having to spend money in intoxicants for the benefit of the landlords. My meaning is that a workman's cocoa house should be, by the influence of the vicar, established in every parish in England; where a man can spend in the evening his leisure hours socially and agreeably with his neighbours and friends; where he can buy a pint of good coffee or cocoa or tea at the same or less price than he can buy the same quantity of beer for; and after he has consumed it, his thirst will not be increased, so that he will be induced to purchase more. If this is accomplished, he will return to his family with more money in his pocket, and sober. This I believe may be carried out in almost every parish, and I will tell you my reason for saying so. Such places as I have described are self-supporting (they need have no religious teaching in them, better not), they pay their expenses and leave a profit. I am speaking from personal experience. Some time since my attention was called to the want of such a place in St. Mary's parish, in this town, by its then vicar, the Rev. C. E. Lamb, and he convinced me of the necessity for one. A piece of land was purchased; we visited several towns that had established cocoa houses already. With such experience the workman's cocoa house at Highfield was erected, at a cost, including furniture, buildings and lands, of £4,400. It was opened in April, 1877, and considerable success has attended it. There are employed in it the manager, his wife, besides one man and two women constantly, with occasional help. The charge for a pint of coffee, cocoa, or tea, is one penny; for half-a-pint one half-penny; bread of all kinds for one half-penny and one penny; with ham, butter or cheese for one penny extra; billiards, bagatelle, cards, dominoes, and skittles. They who use them pay a small sum, and all who conduct themselves properly can go there, read the newspapers, enjoy a warm, cheerful, pleasant room, without being required to pay anything, unless they order some refreshments or play some game. Since the place was opened, in seventeen months there has been sold 29,420 pints of cocoa, 175,720 half-pints; 25,116 pints of coffee, 96,024 half-pints; and 30,064 cups of tea. Ginger beer, lemonade, &c., and milk, in considerable quantities are sold, so that, if only half of the above has been consumed in the place of alcoholic drinks, this one house has done much good, and encouraged habits of temperance in those who have taken advantage of it. The place is opened at 5 a.m., and closed at 11 p.m. The receipts are largest on Saturdays, Mondays, and Tuesdays, when the people have money in their pockets. The other evenings the rooms are full, but little money is received. So far it has paid good interest on the money expended, after making ample deductions for wear and tear. An important feature to attain success after establishing such a place, is for some one, say the vicar, to visit it once every week. Here is a profitable business not requiring much capital, open to anyone who is able and willing to work, and which fairly competes with the fascinations of the gin palace.

This example has resulted in establishing a Limited Company here, who have recently opened two cocoa houses. Their success is even greater than my own.

Leicester is another town where workmen's cocoa houses have been successful. The Rev. Canon Vaughan presided at the opening of one in October, 1877. The cost of the necessary alterations and of fitting it up was £2000, and a rent is paid for it of between £200 and 300 per year. In eleven months 304,000 persons have partaken of refreshments there, 72,000 people have paid one penny each to go into the rooms where the games of billiards, bagatelle, chess, &c., are played, the receipts of the house have been £4400, and the nett receipts after paying all expenses will leave the shareholders a handsome return upon their capital. The same company have opened a second cocoa house, at which my friend Mr. Elliss, the chairman of the Midland Railway, presided on the 23rd September, and he stated two other sites had been taken to erect more of these houses in that town.

A clergyman who intends persuading one or more of his parishioners to do something in the direction I have pointed out, must not frighten them by naming the sums mentioned. A cocoa house may be established on a much more moderate scale. All that is required is to find some suitable place, or a public-house that is not paying its expenses, of which at this time there are scores, and I believe hundreds, in the country; have the rooms made clean, comfortable, and such as a working-man will be happy in for a few hours after the toil of the day is over. I do not see anything very difficult in this arrangement. Very little capital is required, only attention, good judgment and common sense. Any vicar who desires it may find these qualifications in his parish, or a responsibility rests upon him which it is his duty to remove.

The Church may in another way by its influence promote temperance. In many places the beer shops and public-houses do not belong to brewers, but are owned or rented by those who occupy them. A clergyman or some friend of his would confer a great benefit on those around him, if he persuaded such a seller of intoxicants to offer and sell a pint of good, hot, wholesome coffee with the same facility and at the price as he sells the same quantity of beer; for many a man would, if he had the chance, drink a pint of the former, which does him no harm, rather than partake of the latter, which in many cases is so prejudicial. Cannot this be done?

I have observed and found from experience that workmen who drink freely, spirits or beer, cannot bear the same amount of work as those who live temperately. If in this town you go into the Bessemer steel and other furnaces, in hot weather, you will find the temperate man able to do his work easily, and without feeling oppressed; while the intemperate man will be prostrate with the heat, and constantly going outside his furnace for fresh air. He is therefore of less value than the sober, steady man. These opinions are confirmed by many in this locality with whom I have conversed.

The Church may have, and has already, great influence with the young. They have no liking for drink; it is a habit easily acquired,

but very difficult to give up practising. Let the vicar establish a band of hope in his Sunday school, and teach the children to avoid drink, never to touch it, to look upon it as poison, which it is when taken in excess. The next generation, if so taught and instructed, would grow up different beings ; they would be capable of battling with the world, and bearing vigorously the struggle that is before them.

The Wesleyans decided at their late Conference that a band of hope should be established in connection with every Sunday school belonging to that body. The Church of England will do wisely to follow their example.

A clergyman has considerable influence with landowners and others in his locality. He has many opportunities of pointing out the desirability of closing such and such a public-house, on account of its being neither profitable nor convenient to retain it. If he succeeded in doing this, what a change would come over the place ! The people would become happier, richer, better in every way, and more orderly than before. The Church can do much in obtaining an alteration in the licensing laws. The magistrates feel how little power they possess. They have to carry out the law, and, as far as they are able, they do not grant additional publican or beer-house licences ; but what is the fact ? Any man who pays for his house £15 a year rent, and is of good character, sworn to by a witness, can apply at the Brewster Sessions for a licence, and the magistrates are compelled to grant one to him, no matter if they think there are already twice as many houses selling intoxicating drinks as they consider necessary. The result of the decisions by the Licensing Committee of Magistrates in Sheffield, at the Brewster Sessions just concluded, was as follows :—On August 29th, 1878, there were 1821 licences existing—equal to one to every 225 inhabitants ; of these 45 were not renewed. There were 88 new applications for licences ; of these the magistrates refused 28 ; so that they granted 60 new licences to sell alcoholic liquors, only one of which they had power to refuse. Although it is admitted this large population already is too amply provided with places which supply them with intoxicants, yet the justices by the existing laws were compelled to grant 59 of these who applied to them with licences. Further, to show the straits to which holders of these licences were put during the last twelve months, 391 of them were transferred. So many changes denote how unprofitable such a business is at the present time. This wretched state of our licensing laws must speedily compel Parliament to re-consider and deal with them. I hope and trust at the time when this is done the Church will take her proper position, and use her influence to secure the closing of these drinking shops on Sundays ; so far as consuming it on the premises is concerned, at present many sellers of beer only take out licences for six days in the week. Do not misunderstand me, I would not prevent a man purchasing his beer for dinner on Sunday if he desires to do so.

The Church may perform another duty. Where men with large families for the first time are about to take a public-house, the vicar

of the parish, if he hears of such intention, would do a kind act if he used his influence to dissuade him from so perilous an undertaking, pointing out the temptation he was placing before, and the injustice he was doing to, his family.

I will conclude with pointing out another and an important duty devolving upon the Church—the example of total abstinence from drinking alcohol, now so extensively practised by those ardent, sincere, and faithful men who have, from principle, laboured so long in the cause of temperance. The effect they have produced is very great. We meet in public and in private many of our friends and others who have been total abstainers for 10, 20, and even 30 years or more. They have enjoyed the very best of health. Very few people require stimulants—some possibly may do—therefore if we can by any means as Church men and women, by example, by persuasion, by the diffusion of knowledge on this important and all-engrossing evil, and by providing places of resort equally as attractive as the gin palace (without intoxicants), we shall do a great work; and be assured the future greatness and happiness of this country greatly depends upon her people cultivating, learning, and practising habits of temperance.

REV. CANON BASIL WILBERFORCE.

THIS is not my first experience of the difficulties which fall to the lot of the reader of a paper at a Church Congress upon the important subject which is under consideration this evening. Fretted by the impossibility of condensing into 20 minutes a twentieth of the points which he desires to make—certain to foster misunderstanding, by having to leave unexplained innumerable matters capable of explanation—stifled by the use of a manuscript, which ever serves as an iceberg to fervour and an extinguisher to eloquence—he can hope to do but little more than indicate certain lines of thought which may serve as texts for subsequent discussion. It is one characteristic of an age of luxury to deprecate plain speaking about plain sins; to gloss over, with the meretricious tinsel of euphemisms, notorious vices, which eat like a canker into the heart of society; it is one of the despicable deceits of so-called civilization to endure unblushingly the outward manifestation of evil, and prudishly to hide the head when such evils are denounced by their proper names. Such was not the custom of the fearless apostle St. Paul, from whose pen has emanated the Epistle to the Galatians; and the plain unvarnished tale of deadly sins, enumerated in the 5th chapter under the heading of “works of the flesh,” breathes a refreshing atmosphere of candour, and encourages all Christian ministers to clear themselves from the imputation.

“Who dares think one thing and another tell,
My soul detests him as the gates of hell.”

When Christian men and women are ashamed to sin, it will be time

enough for Christian ministers to be ashamed to speak of sin ; and we are here to-night to speak of sin—of foul, treacherous, fascinating sin,—of sin which is the parent of impurity, infidelity, suffering, suicide, murder ; of sin that knows no distinction between rich and poor, man and woman, learned and ignorant ; of sin that stamps its cursed label, like the brand of Cain, upon the besotted features of men and women made in the image of their God, saying—see, here are those redeemed by the blood of the Cross, dedicated body, soul, and spirit to the Lord, and it is written in their faces that their god is their belly.

It would be an easy matter to fill this paper with statistics of our national shame. They have been collected in ghastly and overwhelming array by Mr. William Hoyle ; they are within the reach of all, in the report of Convocation upon Intemperance, a work that should be in every Churchman's library, and they prove beyond a shadow of doubt that misery, ignorance, and crime are prevailing to a most alarming extent ; that there is an evil influence abroad neutralizing every effort, mocking every exertion for the promotion of the well-being of the people. It would be bad enough if this national destroyer confined himself to binding grievous burdens upon the pockets of the community : that in days when legitimate trade is depressed and honest men of business are struggling hard with impending poverty, he should annually scatter to the winds 150 millions, which, if circulated through useful branches of commerce, would impart prosperity to all : that of the millions of rate-supported paupers, who tax so sorely the resources of men of anxious toil, he should claim three out of every four as his own production, it would appear bad enough, I say ; but the mere money tax might be endured ; yet from the length and breadth of the land there comes a cry of human suffering, human agony, human death. The most fearful crimes are committed every day—brutal assaults by fathers upon their children, mothers upon their infants, men upon each other ; and judges, coroners, magistrates, doctors, hangmen, all give the same unvarying testimony—strong drink is alone, they say, the cause. One hundred and eighty thousand persons are licensed to procure their livelihood by flooding the country with strong drink. These occurrences are the logical consequence, and the wealth, the peace, the religion, the property of the great nation are slowly, but surely, going down before the pestilence. The most terrible proof of the extent to which this devilish epidemic is infecting the main-spring of the life of the nation, and one which cannot too often be repeated, is to be found in the report of the visiting justices of the Westminster House of Correction, which exposes the appalling fact that in one year between five and six thousand women were convicted of drunkenness in this place of punishment alone.

But in spite of the publicity which is given in the daily journals to the fruits of England's national sin, the worst results of it never see the light in the newspapers or the blue book. There are working for God in parts of London, Liverpool, and other great cities, devoted ones who are spending their lives in striving to cast the purifying salt of the gospel of Christ into the foul pool of iniquity.

They could tell you of the dark deeds that are done in the so called homes of the drunkard—they could tell you of the cruel blows that fall thick on wife and child—they could tell you of wife and mother lying senseless from some savage assault, all through the long night till dawn peeps in at the window—and the endurance, the forgiveness, the hope for better things in the heart of the poor brave woman constrains her to silence, and the outside world knows nothing of her secret suffering. They could tell you of accursed dens of infamy, where tender boys and girls are initiated into the mysteries of Satan, where, primed with ardent spirits, illegally supplied to them, their young hearts are ruined, their consciences seared as with the hot iron of hell fire, themselves, body and soul, drawn into the vortex of debasement and ruin—drink their task-master, drink their sustainer, drink their tormentor, until at last life becomes intolerable, and a splash in the water, some dark night, tells of another victim of the curse of England, hurried by self-murder into the presence of God.

Now, if these things are simply untrue, I have no business here to-night; but if they are true, terribly, awfully true, then, an assembly of ordained ministers at a Church Congress is the legitimate opportunity for solemnly re-echoing the cry of Moses at the gate of the camp, and asking that question which admits of no prevaricating answer—that question which fired Phinehas, the priest, to rush, sword in hand, into the conflict—that question which nerved the arm of brothers to vengeance on their nearest and dearest—that question, “Who is on the Lord’s side?”

I do not mean to imply that the ministers of the gospel have a monopoly of the responsibility for the souls of those who are perishing through drink: the drunkenness of England is everybody’s responsibility. Drunkenness impoverishes the people, increases taxation, limits the producing power of the nation—it is, therefore, a question for the statesman; drunkenness deteriorates the race, renders life less worth living for by increasing its sorrows, multiplying its perils, aggravating its evils,—it is, therefore, a question for the philanthropist; drunkenness binds the will, clouds the intellect, enslaves humanity, therefore, it is a question for the emancipator, for the pioneer of national liberty. Our ears are tickled in vain by the repetition of smart epigrams as to England being “better free than sober,” for we recollect how such epigrams are annihilated by anticipation in the words of Byron—

“Thinkest thou that there is no tyranny but that of blood and chains?
The despotism of vice, the weakness, the wickedness of luxury,
The negligence, the apathy, the evils of sensual sloth,
Produce ten thousand tyrants.”

But, drunkenness locks up the kingdom of heaven, bars the channels of grace between the soul of man and the life-giving Spirit of God, defiles the temple of the Holy Ghost, crucifies the Son of God afresh and puts Him to an open shame, is earthly, sensual, devilish; and therefore it is pre-eminently a question for the accredited shepherds of the souls of men.

In a paper read at a previous Church Congress no little offence

was given by words somewhat similar to these. I would not willingly cause offence. But if Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold I cannot go beyond what I believe to be the word of the Lord my God to do less or more. I must be permitted to guard myself after the method of the pious member of the Society of Friends who discovered a housebreaker in his bedchamber. Reaching down a fowling-piece from the shelf, he softly remarked, "Friend, thee had better get out of the way, for I intend to fire this gun just where thee stands." I therefore boldly repeat the language of one of England's greatest statesmen, and say, "If this evil is to be effectually dealt with you must not look to the world or the legislature to take the initiative; *the Church of Christ must strike the blow*—and it is *we*, who have been solemnly set apart by ordination to fight the battle of the King of kings, who are constrained to spend and be spent in liberating the souls whose cure and government has been committed to us from the power of the accursed idol before whom they are bowing down. When we are indifferent, unenthusiastic, temporizing, in the presence of overwhelming evils such as these, we are but caricatures—not likenesses—of our Divine Master. When we timidly hold ourselves aloof from this special development of the battle between Heaven and Hell, when we take shelter behind the motto, *quieta non movere*, we are as those

"Who swore that the love of souls had drawn them
To the Church—yet strewed the path
That led to Hell with tempting flowers,
And in the ears of sinners as they took the way
To death, they whispered peace."

Yes, it is *our* question! It is our question by the sacredness of our high calling, by the Name we bow before; it is our question, because we are not reformers of society, but physicians of souls, because with us eternity overshadows time, because we are bound to view man as an immortal being in peril by sin, in pity for the miseries of which our Master wept on Olivet, in atonement for the guilt of which He bled on Calvary.

Now what can we as clergy do to lessen the causes, to diminish the effects of this torrent of evil? Pardon me if I say, with all seriousness, that I do not believe it possible for one of us, who has heartily realised the magnitude of the evil, to kneel down before our God with the prayer, "Lord, what wilt *thou* have *me* to do?" without being at once commissioned to our corner of the vineyard. But this we can do—we can divest our minds of prejudice, we can stop our ears to those who would soothe us into inaction by bidding us leave the battle to the gradual influence of increasing knowledge and refinement. We can reflect upon the trifling influence knowledge and refinement have had in the past in purifying the heart of sinning humanity. Knowledge and refinement! Were they wanting to Charles Lamb, the poet and the essayist? and did they render less bitter that pathetic wail, "From what have I fallen, if the child that I remember was indeed myself?" Knowledge and refinement! Are they wanting to those high-born names which bespatter the pages of our newspapers with the filth of the divorce court? And it

is the testimony of the leading judge of that court of Sodom that nine out of ten of the cases that come before him are the results of intemperance. First, then, we can set our faces as a flint against these common-places, which do but mock the agony of perishing thousands.

Again, believing that the peril of souls is of more importance than the traditions of society, the interests of a particular trade, the platitudes of the press, the babblings of shallow political triflers, we can shake ourselves free from what one has well termed "the devil's cobwebs of guilty custom and guilty acquiescence." Thus, hitherto, we have perhaps been tolerating evils in our parish rather than make ourselves unpopular by waging war against them. Now we can become aggressive; we can constantly keep the question before the notice of magistrates, landowners, and the public. At times of election we can show by our exertions and our votes that we are in earnest, that we estimate the peril to souls higher than our traditional politics, that we are sick and weary of the shifty expedients and cowardly policy in dealing with this cancer of society, which is such a blot upon the legislature, and that we will vote only for that candidate for parliamentary honours who will pledge himself to some bold, effective remedial measure.

We can enforce, by means of a vigilance committee or otherwise, existing legislation as to serving drink to drunken persons and young children, and at illegal hours. We can engage a professional man to oppose, at every brewster sessions, the issue of fresh licenses. We can add to our parochial organization an earnest temperance missionary, whose one duty is to search for the fallen, to encourage the waverers, to form public opinion. We can shake ourselves free from all complicity, by declining to sign any publican's testimonial; by refusing ever to lease an acre of our glebe for building purposes without a stringent covenant to exclude public-houses.

We shall possibly become unpopular, the drunkards will make songs upon us, the public-house world will hate us. *So much the better for us.* We are striking a blow for Him whom the world hated before it hated us. We shall be freely told that by crusading against the interests of a powerful, charitable, state-protected trade we are jeopardising the stability of the Church and alienating men from our ministry. If it were so, then perish the Establishment that cannot stand without such crutches. But it is NOT true. The best claim the Establishment can make upon the confidence of the nation is her readiness to dare all in her effort to obliterate national sins. The surest reply the individual clergyman can make to those who revile him for crusading against vice is the life of practical, courageous, self-denying usefulness, for "*cujus vita fulgor, ejus verba tonitrua.*" I am taking it for granted that in every parish there will be, *first*, a temperance society, and attached to it a band of hope. Years ago the good Bishop Stanley, of Norwich, spoke with a prophet's utterance, and said: "I speak after much reflection, and as in the presence of God. I am fully persuaded that temperance societies will be found the great regenerators of the country." Yes, and they will be found also the life and soul of

home mission work; they will become the nucleus of Bible classes, prayer meetings, and confirmation classes. Where a thorough-going temperance society has been working in a parish its effects are so marked that you are able to say, "Happy are the people that are in such a case; yea, blessed are the people who have the Lord for their God." And, *secondly*, a really good temperance refreshment room, not a dingy, fly-blown kennel of discomfort, but a bright, cheerful, gas-lit tavern, where pipes may be smoked, and politics may be talked, and refuge may be had from the discomfort of washing-day, without the assistance of that which men, "put into their mouths to steal away their brains."

I have but hastily and imperfectly indicated some of the directions in which real work may be done. If any are induced by these few words to gird up their loins and plunge into the battle I can assure them, from practical experience, that an abundant reward even in this world will attend them. It is a noble strife, for the battle is the Lord's. Under the banner of the Cross it must be fought: that banner is our lock of strength against the Philistine; without it we become as other men.

And when blessing and success attend our efforts, when returned prodigals are kneeling at our altars, when, co-operating with the Spirit of God, we have helped to heal the bitter waters of the world, self must be utterly forgotten, the glory must be rendered to God, and we must echo the words of Elisha when he cast the salt into the bitter waters of Jericho, "Thus saith the Lord, *I have healed these waters.*"

ADDRESSES.

CLARKE ASPINALL, Esq., J.P., Coroner for Liverpool.

AFTER the most telling papers which we have all rejoiced to hear, anything I can say must I fear be but tame and unattractive. I am here to-night privileged to occupy your time by the gracious invitation of your committee, so I shall not delay you with apologies. The judgment exercised in asking me to speak was theirs, not mine. I come from the large and important town of Liverpool, and while I have no authority to represent it, I may venture to say that no town in England has a more hard-working body of clergy, and no town is more alive to the evils of intemperance or more active in putting them under restraint.

In all temperance gatherings there is not unfrequently a natural and perhaps excusable tendency to overstate matters, and I suppose one reason why this is so, is that strong statements are with very zealous people acceptable and go down. I think that some of our best and most Christian people err in that direction without being in the least conscious of it.

I speak to you as a Magistrate of some experience and also as a Coroner of many years standing, in an enormous community where more than half-a-million of people are congregated. My tale therefore, such as it is, at least comes from one who, whatever his own personal shortcomings may be, ought to have a knowledge of this subject.

I see death nearly every day in its most repulsive forms, indescribable in its sadness. I see life every day in a similar way. I continually meet with distress in its

greatest intensity, and therefore surely if I am not made of something harder than steel I must have had my feelings deeply touched, and I thank God that my sympathy with suffering and my sympathy with sadness is as keen now as it was in my earliest official life. Nevertheless, I have lived long enough to learn this lesson, which I believe after lengthened experience to be a true one—namely—that the monster evil which we have to conquer must be fought against throughout not only in a spirit of real earnestness, but likewise in a spirit of moderation and liberality, as well as in a spirit of Christian love. And if I am asked to define the position of the Church in this matter, although I shrink from any such responsibility,—but I cannot forget that she has lay as well as clerical members—I should say that her duty is to do all that she can do earnestly, anxiously and prayerfully, but moderately, judiciously, and liberally.

Recollect what this Church of England of ours is. This Church I believe is one of the greatest of our national blessings, which I trust will be long preserved to us as it is at present by law established. Recollect that she is the guardian of everything that is sacred and good amongst us, and that she is the responsible organization for the moral and spiritual welfare—and for the religious (and to a large extent the secular) education as well—of a large proportion of the people of this much favoured land. To her I would further say this—do all you have to do in this direction as you do in others, like a good workman, with the tools provided for you, and get better tools as workmen do when opportunity offers; but do not be satisfied with what some of us are too often contented with—to do little else but talk, the burden of our complaint being, that it is everybody's fault but our own that things are as they are, and that when everybody agrees with us, whether we are right or not, then, and not till then, the good time will come; but that at present we are obliged to wait a little longer.

There are also amongst us those good people, aye, good beyond anything I can say on their behalf—who are possessed with the all-absorbing idea that their plan is not only the best, but absolutely the only plan in the world for accomplishing the regeneration of this nation in the matter of intemperance. Well, I don't object to people of that kind: on the contrary, I honour them very much, and agree with them as far as I am able, and differ with them as little as I can, but their usefulness is marred by the extremeness of their course of action.

Then there is a much larger class who are equally dogmatic in their line of argument, if argument it be, and they in turn say that everything is wrong, and that until everything is turned upside down nothing will be right. Now who is there that will deny that these workers are downright good people, and people who are as earnest and honest in their belief as it is possible for good men and women to be? But we do not necessarily see things as they see them.

We are all interested in gaining the victory; but surely it is as well that before we enter upon the warfare we should try to be agreed as to the best way of carrying it on, or at least agree to differ and not make war upon one another.

For my part, I do not believe that the law is anything like so bad as some people say it is; but I do believe that if in years gone by the Justices and others had been influenced in their administration of the law by the wholesome action of public opinion, as they now are, they would never have allowed the present state of things to come to pass. The law might be better and it might be worse, and the administration of the law might now be better than it sometimes is; but it is undoubtedly a great deal better than it was a few years ago, and for that we have to thank public opinion.

It is of no use putting responsibility off from ourselves—placing it here and not there, for grave responsibility is with us all.

Is it not our boast that Parliament, which makes our laws is the reflex of the

national will? And if therefore we do not like our Parliament we should surely change it; if we do not like our laws we should surely endeavour to get them altered; but do not let us sit at home in our easy chairs, attend a temperance meeting now and again, and then call ourselves energetic and enthusiastic apostles of temperance.

The fact is the whole nation needs to be roused, the whole nation needs to feel its real responsibility in this weighty matter. The blame is nowhere in particular, it is everywhere in general—it is with us all.

I have thus imperfectly sketched some of the views which I hold, and I feel quite sure I shall receive your kind credit for having explained them to the best of my ability in the very limited time at my disposal.

Speaking then my last word, and as a layman, I do strongly believe that whilst the counter-attractions and remedies are very numerous indeed, and feeling most thoroughly that we all ought to be willing and glad to try every remedial measure at all calculated to do good, still the arm of flesh alone can never lead us to real victory. We must trust to a higher Power than our own, always remembering in our work for God and our neighbour—and this is surely such—that—

“The Church’s one foundation
Is Jesus Christ her Lord;
She is His new Creation
By water and the Word.”

T. K. CHAMBERS, Esq., M.D., London.

A DEFENCE against an insidious enemy is most likely to be successful when it is based upon a knowledge of his strong points. To guard against the evils of alcoholic intoxication we must understand and fully appreciate the advantages which alcohol can confer. We must learn the physiology of the question before its pathology. These advantages to a medical mind are shortly summed up under its action as an *æsthetic*. But to many of my audience that word probably does not convey so much meaning as it does to a physiologist, and I must enlarge somewhat by citing instances which will bring the matter more home to you. The action of an *anæsthetic* is to blunt the sensibility of the nervous system. Let a man take the smallest dose capable of general diffusion through the body, and he will find that the delicate appreciation of small objects by peculiarly sensitive parts, such as the lips or finger tips, is measurably lessened. The ancient Greeks used to wear engraved gems, which they called *ἀμεθύστοι*, ‘sober-stones’ (whence our word “amethyst”), by which they knew when they had enough, perhaps too much, wine. When the intaglio became obscure, it was time to stop.

This temporary and moderate diminution of nerve action being generally diffused throughout the whole man is a mighty power. It renders him proof against the wear and tear of tissue and mind which external objects effect through the nerves. After an anxious and fatiguing day’s march, pressing on against time to Coomassie, the soldier’s whole frame is fevered, his appetite is gone, sleep will be denied to his racked and twitching muscles, and he rises next morning stiff and unrefreshed. But let him get the usual ration of rum, and the fever heat is abated, he eats a good supper, sleeps sound, and wakes up a new man. Such is the account given of the action of alcohol by a devoted teetotaller, Dr. Parkes, in his report on the Ashantee campaign. The over-worked labourer, the anxious tradesman, the worried statesman, is similarly benefited by checking with alcohol the functioning of the nerves, when the work which they have been called upon to do is finished.

In febrile and inflammatory diseases this abnormal and futile nerve action is declared by an increase of bodily temperature: the tissues are as much burnt up and worn away by a day's fever as if the patient had been climbing Mont Blanc. Treat him with alcohol—the heat is reduced, the delirious mind steadied, and the excessive excretion stayed. In a similar manner the shock of wounds, bruises, and shakes is rendered less injurious. The alcoholised man is stricken, and he knows it not, or, at least, feels it less than he otherwise would, and the reaction of his frame is less. These various conditions of weariness, worry, ill-health, and accident are in one sense of the word extraordinary, but in the aggregate are frequent, and form a component part of all our lives. The action of alcohol is to render us less sensitive of living. Now, those to whom life is a joy, to whom external things are beautiful and sweet, positively lose by not appreciating them to their full extent. But how can we wonder that a brutalised man, surrounded by filth, cruelty, ugliness, vice, and wretchedness should take a pessimist view, and when he sees a comrade drunk in a gutter, should wish he were "half as happy?" The happiness is in unconsciousness of that which it is pain to feel.

I think clergymen would do well not to ignore these positive gains which alcohol offers. I think they would do well to draw attention to its true uses, and not only to allude to them as a sort of concession, but to enter much more into detail than time allows me to do. I never hear the words wine, beer, or gin mentioned in a sermon, and I should like to hear them. I should like also to hear myself and my neighbours taught when their consumption is right and when it is wrong. I should like the preacher to act the part of the old Greeks' "sober-stone," and tell us when we have had enough. But he will do very wrong if he tells us we have had enough when we have had none, because experience tells us that is untrue. I should like also more to be made of temperance as a positive Christian grace. When St. Paul denounces "drunkenness, revellings, and such like," he sets up "temperance" to take their place. It is something much more than mere abstinence from intemperance, just as modesty is much more than abstinence from lewdness. Let virtue flourish, and vice withers without our rooting it up.

To counteract the temptation to blunting the senses with liquor, life should be made more socially enjoyable. A clean, pleasant home, civil speech, well-cooked food, manly amusements, such as dancing, cricket, football, music, holiday excursions, begin at the right end of a man's heart. They lead to the truest Christianity, to a care for other men. Social enjoyment is real altruism, of which temperance is a branch. To keep oneself in health and vigour, so as to be a useful member of society, is not selfish, though it contributes to individual happiness. But all excess is wholly and entirely selfish. It aims at making self comfortable by shirking the common lot to which it leaves others exposed, and exposed all the more because the coward refuses to share it with them. The sot knows very well that the money and time he spends would go very far towards clearing away the misery which surrounds himself and others, but he deliberately prefers to shut up his senses to it. Surely it is useless to talk as if the only sin were in the final act, which in point of fact is a logical deduction from the false premises of selfishness. Base your arguments on the ground of the essential folly of self-seeking; show by example, by education, by patient forbearance, that a man can be happy only when he sees others happy round him—point out to him that such is the way in which God enjoys Himself, and that such is the source of enjoyment he must expect when his being is perfected. You know it is true; then say it openly. No man who has got such truths into his head is likely to get drunk.

English people are unfortunate in not being easily amused. To the Southern

Italian, and to most dwellers round the Mediterranean, life is made joyous enough by a puppet show, a village *festa*, a procession round the church, a few games of a childish character, the drawing of a tombola, some squibs in honour of the parish saint, or simply by lying on the back thinking of nothing and seeing his friends equally happy round him. But to an Englishman, rightly or wrongly, such a life is intolerable. His amusements must have a much more business character, and must engage the intellect as well as the emotions. This sets our clergy a hard task when they try to engage their flocks in healthy occupation for leisure hours. Cricket and football, flower-shows, athletic sports, village reading-rooms, self-managing dispensaries, and such-like institutions are laborious works to set a-going; but they contribute more than anything else to attach a man to his neighbours, to make him proud first of his parish, then of his county, then of his country—in fact, to teach him “who is his neighbour” by a practical illustration. And thus he will have made a longer step towards temperance than by the practice of ascetic abstinence.

A clergyman tells me he has become a total abstainer as a good example to others. It may be a good example to some sort of people, but it is a bad one to me, and to all temperate users, for it makes us think he is likely to be a prejudiced adviser. And I beg to observe that we are a large proportion of his congregation, and the most useful citizens that England has. A few months ago I advised a patient entirely to forswear tobacco, which was injuring his health. “May I ask,” quoth he, “if you are a smoker yourself?” “Yes, I am; I smoked a pipe last night.” “Well,” said he, “then I’ll follow your advice. I didn’t follow Dr. So-and-so’s, he was so prejudiced.”

REV. J. DAVENPORT KELLY.

IN a number of the *Lancet* which appeared in August was a paragraph that struck me forcibly. Speaking of intemperance among women, it made several suggestions—as better education, kindly advice from medical men and others who could influence the poor—and, deploring the apparent powerlessness of legislators and moralists, called on the Church to do greater things than had yet been done. It is a call which comes from many quarters, to which we cannot turn a deaf ear.

We are told that the Church must be fearless to face the social problems of the age. Here is one that stands in the forefront; the problem how we are to grapple with an evil that is, admittedly, among social sins one of the most destructive, insidious, and widely spread, polluting the quiet English village that seems the abode of peace as much as it defiles whole districts of our great cities. Previous speakers have addressed themselves to the parochial, medical, and legislative aspects of the question. I should like, before the discussion is thrown open, to say a few words on the religious side of the subject of temperance.

It appears to me to be eminently one that requires the highest of all sanctions. The fact that it has suffered so much in the minds of many from its being supposed to be proclaimed as the whole duty of man, is a reason why it should be inculcated as part of the duty of self-control which is imposed on all by our most holy faith.

A charge is sometimes brought against the advocates of sobriety, of putting temperance in the place of the gospel. A damaging charge, if it can be sustained. I cannot say that in some cases it may not have had foundation, for I cannot prove a universal negative. If proved, it shows there are unwise persons in our ranks, as elsewhere. But this I do see, that in the lives of those who stand highest in a temperance point of view, as well as in

Baseless
attack.

the estimation of all true well-wishers of their country, they have put this subject in its true position as part of the great work of training the soul for carrying out the will of God.

Here one striking fact meets us—that in the work of quickening the spiritual life, of kindling into flame the dying embers of their higher nature, almost all successful workers have found themselves constrained to adopt temperance work as one of their most potent weapons, and this, without having previously intended to take it up.

In reply to our inquiries comes the same answer from all quarters—from the coffee-rooms of Dorking, from the working men's hall of Shrewsbury, from the clergyman's daughter who has told us of "ploughing and sowing" on the Yorkshire farms, garrison work at Portsmouth, labourers among East-end Arabs, from him who devoted a quarter of a century to apostolic work in New Zealand, and who though dead yet speaketh; all find that without the teaching of temperance they lose one of their best means of supporting that higher religious life which they desire to build up.

It is not among the poor or neglected only that the Church's duty in relation to this subject is to be discharged.

This, we are constantly told, not without pride, is a high-pressure age. And this feverish haste which brings, as medical men tell us, certain physical ills to heart and brain, induces also perils to the soul—anxiety to amass wealth, a determination to enjoy it, luxurious living, search for enjoyment of every kind, making pleasure the first object. I am not speaking as a preacher, but only repeating what the journals of society clearly show, and many avowedly practise.

Against this it is the duty of the Church to protest, to bring against this exciting style of living the claims of a higher self-denying life which rejoices in "plain living and high thinking," which seeks its stimulant in the loud calls to action that come from the poverty, ignorance, and vice around, and thus to help to form a correct public opinion.

In our dealing with intemperance we must not be contented with the negative side of our work. It is an easy thing to say do not drink to excess; do not frequent the public-house; but if we are to make our words of counsel effective, we must do something more—we must put ourselves in the position of our working brother, understand his wants, and try to meet them. To make use of a well-known phrase, we must show the "sweet reasonableness" that ought to characterise the National Church. Most true are the words of the London Club and Institute Union:—"Such intemperance has been mainly caused by the fact that workmen have no place of resort in their leisure hours except the public-house, when they desire the society of their fellows, relaxation after toil, and the organisation of provident and other economic agencies."

Think of the number of young unmarried men, of whom one gave his experience as he described, when the evening meal of the house where he lodged was over, the father drawing up to one side of the fire, the mother to the other, the little ones in the middle with their school lessons to prepare, and himself decidedly one too many for the party. Where was he to go? Is it not our duty to make special provision for such as he, in reading-rooms, workmen's clubs, in evening classes, in pleasant, well-lighted rooms, kept scrupulously clean, cheerful and inviting, to show them the bright side of religion in caring for common life? This good work is begun; see that it is carried on and extended.

In the first rank of the agencies against intemperance my own observation and experience would lead me to place Bands of Hope for our young people.

Most earnest
workers are
temperance
advocates.

In all grades of
Society.

Our teaching
must be
more than
negative.

"Bands of
Hope."

We are from time to time completely puzzled how to deal with cases that are the opprobrium of our civilisation, and the despair of our magistrates—men and women that are brought up for the fiftieth time or more for drunkenness. For the offenders themselves, another month's confinement, a suggested plan for cumulative sentences, or a hospital for dipsomaniacs, is what society affords. But a practical plan to prevent such foul excrescences from growing up in our midst is to take hold of the young and guard them by a pledge, under the sanction of religion and parental authority, against the first temptation to the vice.

Be not afraid that parents, from jealousy of your interference, will oppose you. Even the victims to a morbid appetite are only too glad to have their children saved from ruin. I have known, in a case connected with my own Band of Hope, a parent that in a moment of insobriety almost forced drink on her child, who yet the next morning, offered every help to the child to keep the pledge which that little one sought as a protection from the temptation thrown in its way by its mother.

We must not be prematurely jubilant about our success.

We have a right to be thankful for many cheering signs; that there is less drinking at table, that intemperance is no longer fashionable, that total abstinence is no longer looked on as betokening a sapless condition of will are gratifying facts, and, let me add, are in no little degree due to the action of the Church of England Temperance Society, with its double basis. Five-and-a-half years have elapsed since the society was reorganised. The little gathering in the library of Lambeth has now its roots in almost every parish in the kingdom; men that held aloof because of their fear lest they should be committed to extreme views, have gladly joined in promoting temperance. The hearts of the noble band of men that were before waging war with intemperance with failing hearts are roused to more vigorous exertions; but with the amount spent annually in drink, with the increasing value of public-houses, with the uncontradicted statement of the increase of intemperance among women, there is no room for relaxation of effort. Even where police returns show an apparent improvement, it is too often to be accounted for by the badness of the times and the scarcity of money—the explanation which the Chief Constable of Salford gives of the diminution seen in his last report, for the first time for many years, of a diminution of charges for intemperance.

Before sitting down, I would make an appeal which is, I fear, not
 Brotherly
 unity. unneeded, for brotherly unity between abstainers and non-abstainers.

Nothing is more enjoyed by our adversaries, nothing does more to defeat our object than dissension and jealousy amongst ourselves.

There is room in the Church for both; and when I look on what has been done, and may be done, by men of both sections, I cannot bring myself to say a word against the stoutest-hearted supporters of Christian liberty on either side. Let each use his utmost efforts for the promotion of personal purity and self-control; let them unite, as they loyally can, in labouring for amended licensing laws, for the reduction of the number of places of temptation, improved dwellings, multiplication of harmless places of resort, for an unstained Sunday; let the non-abstainer claim and maintain his place at council board and committee meeting, and causes of past divergence will be forgotten, asperities will be removed, and the presence of a great national danger will echo the words spoken by a great captain to the two officers at variance. "Gentlemen, there is the enemy; shake hands."

DISCUSSION.

The BISHOP OF NIAGARA.

I WAS privileged, 28 years ago, to visit, for the first time, this great and blessed country; eleven years ago I repeated my visit; and now, for the third time, I am here, and from the bottom of my heart I thank God that I have this opportunity of addressing you. I should not have asked to be heard upon this occasion, if I had not to state something which, I think, will encourage you. I come from the province of Ontario, which is by far the largest and most important province of Canada, which dominion is the third maritime power of the world; and in that province there is not any place where intoxicating liquor can be bought on the Sabbath day. I was delighted to see the Parliament of Great Britain at its last session passing that Act, which was petitioned for by the people of Ireland, for the closing of public-houses on Sundays, and I trust that the people of England will send up to Parliament a similar petition. In Canada, I may say that we find no inconvenience in carrying out the law in this particular, and in addition I will mention, that in every place where liquor is sold, even in wholesale houses of business, it is our custom that they shall all be closed on the day of an election. Some years ago there was an election held in Toronto, and the next day there was not a single drunkard for the magistrates to punish. The temptation was not there; and no one was tempted. I mention these few facts for the encouragement of those who are doing what they can to increase the temperance of this great country; and I trust their efforts will be crowned with success.

The Rev. Canon RYLE, Vicar of Stradbroke.

My Lord Archbishop,—I only venture to occupy the attention of this meeting for ten minutes, not as one who knows large towns, but as one who, for thirty-seven years, has been a minister of Christ in rural parishes. I do so because I should feel ashamed if I did not take the opportunity of adding my testimony upon this vast subject. During these 37 years I have had to do with the middle and lower classes almost exclusively. My own parish contains only 1500 people; and that is a mere drop of water in the ocean compared to a place like Sheffield. In such a parish you can know something, more or less, of the habits of all the people. I have studied the people of rural parishes like a man taking a watch to pieces to see what every part of it means; and I have come to the very decided conclusion, that of all the gigantic evils we have to face in the Church of England there is none to be compared with the enormous evil of intemperance. It is not of the open, noisy, roaring drunkenness that I so much complain as the habit of deliberately and constantly drinking more than is good for the people who drink it. I feel that the Church is bound to speak very plainly on this point. I believe the matter wants preaching about, and if Paul and the other apostles had seen the intemperance of the present times they would have preached earnestly and powerfully against it, not mincing matters, but plainly calling a spade a spade. I know that some people think it very vulgar to speak of such things as gin, brandy, and rum, from the pulpit; but I think that it is our plain duty to go into details, and to warn our people against evil by calling things by their right names. The first thing I want

is, that we should continually try to raise the moral standard of the country on the matter of intemperance. It is astonishing how pretty names and smart words are used for drinking and drunkenness. I will not go into that matter more minutely; but I must repeat that we should try and raise the present low state of public feeling upon the subject. Many years ago I was connected with a rural parish, where one of the officials was a notorious drunkard. I did all I could to make him see the evil of his ways, but with no result. At last I would not allow him to come to the Lord's Table, and, being a very young man, I wrote to the Chancellor of the Diocese to know what further steps I should take. The answer was that I should take proceedings against my official in some law court of which I then had never heard. I know a little more of ecclesiastical courts now. And the Chancellor added that unless I could bring two or three credible witnesses to prove the charge, I had better have nothing to do with the matter. I found I could get no witnesses to come forward. There was a low state of public feeling in the parish on the matter of drunkenness, and that is what I believe lies at the bottom of drunkenness throughout England. The whole standard of public feeling wants raising. Then there are two or three social customs which we all ought to set our faces against. People are in the habit, on all sorts of occasions, of giving a man sixpence to drink their healths; or if a person brings to our houses presents, a haunch of venison, a brace of birds or the like—we give him a glass of beer. No one knows how many glasses of intoxicating liquors are given away in that manner. This habit of treating is a bad one, and we ought to set our faces against it and denounce it. Then there is another point I wish to add: we ought to preach against drinking customs. There is a little book by Mr. Dunlop, of Scotland, on drinking customs, which shows how deep-rooted they are. A bricklayer does not like to begin a job without wetting it with a drink; a farmer sells a sheep, a bullock, or a pig, and they must have a drink—they hate a dry bargain, and must have a glass of something over it. There are many more drinking customs, which I have not time to refer to; but I cannot refrain from denouncing the detestable customs of drinking between meals. My firm belief is that if we induce people to take the pledge not to drink between meals we shall strike a blow at the root of five-sixths of all the drunkenness in the country. Men go out at eleven, and must needs have something to drink before dinner, and after that they must have something more at four. We all know how many people drink a glass of sherry now and a glass of sherry then, when there is no reason or necessity for it. These are the little things that let in the thin edge of the wedge. Let us all put our shoulders to the wheel in this matter, and do our best to get rid of these customs; there is no cause for despair. There was plenty of drunkenness at Rome—we know from the description of Juvenal and other writers—in the time of St. Paul, but the apostle said:—"I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of Christ to salvation." There is no devil too strong for Christ to cast out. Our Lord Jesus Christ can drive out the devil of drunkenness, and send a man home clothed in his right mind. Let us by all means give the people counter-attractions, such as reading rooms, athletics, &c. I have them in my parish, and I encourage anything to keep men away from the bar of the public-house. The souls of the drunkards and adulterers are not to be lost for want of effort. The same grace of the Lord Jesus Christ which saved the thief on the cross is able to save even them. Let us preach up Christ's mercy and grace, and boldly denounce the great sin of the day; and not least, let us pray for the Holy Spirit of God to come down in power to stem the pestilence of intemperance, which is now doing so much harm.

Archdeacon EMERY.

It has not been my privilege to hear the papers or prepared speeches to-night, because my duties have detained me at the section meeting; but I wish to say a few words on the present occasion, because I represent in some sort the originators of the Church of England Temperance Society. It was my great privilege some years ago to be placed upon the committee of the Convocation of Canterbury appointed to consider the question of intemperance. I had then considerable correspondence with the late Archdeacon Sandford, the chairman, on the subject. You know what a valuable report of that committee was put forth. It was one of the chief contributions, indeed, to the literature of temperance, and laid the basis of the great national movement for the correction or repression of intemperance. At that time two of the principal teetotal societies were anxious to get the *imprimatur* of the Church of England for their work. The Convocation committee considered the matter fully, as to whether it was possible for the Church of England to put her *imprimatur* upon total abstinence as a duty for all; and decided that it could not do so consistently with Church doctrine and rightful Christian liberty. I then ventured to suggest that though there was a difficulty in acceding to the request of the two societies, yet that, if the word temperance were put first, and the word teetotalism second, I believed that Convocation and the Church of England might agree to take up the cause of temperance, which would, perhaps, end in promoting much voluntary total abstinence. That is the platform on which we are now all united, and I am glad that the speakers to-night have not pressed the subject of teetotalism as against temperance. Some of us temperance people have been a little offended when we have heard it hinted elsewhere that temperate people were almost worse than drunkards. We are all bound to temperance in our baptism, and if we proceed on that principle of the Christian life, and try to form active and efficiently-worked temperance societies in every parish, we shall do a great deal to check the evil we all deplore, and no doubt shall, at the same time, produce a greater number of teetotallers. But of this I am perfectly persuaded, that if members of temperance societies press teetotalism too much, and throw a slur on temperance folk as a weak-kneed sort of people, they will greatly discourage the good work, and put a stumbling-block in the way of the temperance cause, which we all have at heart. Then, let me add, we do want to promote the innocent pleasures of the people—even the pleasure of the appetite. It is not enough to say that people must drink water only. We should try to provide them with other drinks, satisfying and pleasing, yet wholesome, at railway stations and at work, in the streets and in reading-rooms. It might be made, I am sure, more easy than it is to obtain non-alcoholic drinks at a reasonable price. I took the trouble on one occasion to go into a railway station on a volunteer fête day, to notice the habits of the people. I asked for a cup of tea, but I had to wait a quarter of an hour for it, and was then charged too much. Meanwhile, other people came in, got their glasses of beer and other beverages, at little cost, swallowed them down quickly, and went away again. If other drinks were provided cheaply and quickly, a great deal, depend upon it, would be done to stop much injurious drinking. I am very strongly impressed, too, with the belief that, to a very great extent, the cause of temperance is in the hands of the great brewers and distillers of the country. They own the mass of the public-houses, and they could do much for temperance by seeing the law properly carried out; by taking care to have respectable people in their houses, who would not allow people to drink too much; by using a little self-denial in the matter of profits, and being satisfied with less profits rather than suffer drinking. Individually the

members of that rich body of brewers and distillers are anxious, doubtless, to promote temperance. They are often liberal in good works, and they might do still further work for God in the way I have now suggested. I have heard so much as to the power of the brewers and distillers, that I cannot help thinking these rich and often philanthropic men have, to a great extent, the cause of temperance and the cause of religion in this country very much in their own hands.

REV. CANON HARPER, Vicar of Selby.

"PATIENT and forbearing," our Congress Committee Collect said, "towards those who differ from us." I differ, and therefore present myself for your patience and forbearance. I differ fundamentally from all with whom it is not a fixed first principle that drinking wine and beer is better than not drinking them, self-governing moderation better than tied-up abstinence, as surely as the full freedom of full health is better than the valetudinarian's sad necessity of living by rule; better to "enter into life" with the *whole* body, than halt or maimed, with one of the members perished; better to be the Christian father of a Christian family, than among those who "have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake."

If I speak strongly, it is because I feel strongly. If I take the tone of one convinced, it is because I *am* convinced. I feel that the more deadly the disease, the more dreadful is the mischief of a mistaken treatment. I am convinced that in this drink-disease there has been mistaken treatment. The Nonconformists were in the field first and fell into the mistake. The Church, which should have corrected it, has continued it. The mistake has been in thinking that because cripples require crutches, therefore crutch-life is the high, ideal life of humanity.

Beer slaves are of two classes. There are those who are always ready to face beer their master, and are always mastered by him, drinking themselves drunk as often as they have the opportunity. These are the *drinking* beer slaves. And there are those who never dare face beer their master, knowing that they *would* be mastered by him; never drinking, and therefore never drunken. These are the *abstaining* beer slaves. (Great interruption).

HIS GRACE THE PRESIDENT.

I ENTREAT the Congress to remember that we shall best get out the truth by hearing both sides.

REV. CANON HARPER.

I HAVE come forward to be the object of your patience and forbearance. I said so at the beginning. As a Christian minister, nay as a Christian *man*, I object to both classes. I will be neither a drinking beer slave nor an abstaining beer slave. I will not be a beer slave at all, nor make-believe to be one; I will be, and be avowedly, a beer *master*,—which, by God's grace I *am*.

For me, beer is God's good creature and my good servant. On some hot summer day, heated with walking or heated with working, Bass's beer I find to be of all beverages the most refreshing; better than milk, though milk is very good; better than water, quite decidedly better than water; better than cold tea, that I own is an unverified hypothesis. I give thanks to God for my good beer, for my good faculty of enjoying it, for my good power of enjoying it with self-governing moderation. "Why am I evil spoken of for which I give thanks?"

St. Paul's question; but what about St. Paul's answer? The "weak brother for

whom Christ died," what about him? What about self-sacrifice and "no meat while the world standeth?" What about the help and encouragement of good example?

Is it a good example to be making-believe with tied-up abstinence, like some miserable mendicant who ties up his leg when the limb is sound? Self-governing moderation, surely, is the good example, declaring manifestly, "I can do all things through Christ, which strengtheneth me." "Help my poor brother," but such help would help to degrade him. How unmanly if he will not part with his deadly-diseased limb without my parting with mine, which is in full health! How silly, if he finds himself helped in his bitterly hard abstinence, by my abstinence which costs me, in comparison, nothing at all! I ought to abstain from something as hard for me to abstain from as his abstinence from drink is hard to him; from money-making, if I am a worshipper of Mammon; from any more steps on the ladder of promotion, if I am ambitious; from accepting any more invitations, if I am a brilliant diner-out.

Teetotalism, then, to its use as a crutch for cripples. But now, how about the *Public-house of the future*? Oh, for time and power to answer that question adequately! I will but say, have your coffee and cocoa by all means in it, your books and newspapers, your games, "all kinds of music." Have everything for enjoyment and pleasant companionship; but have full freedom in it for self-governing moderation, and have God's wine and beer for that moderation and that freedom. And in the public-house of the future you will want also the publican of the future. Try to find him sometimes in the publican of the present. Try for the co-operation instead of the opposition of the licensed victuallers. Are not the licensed victuallers also "blood of your blood and bone of your bone?" Are not the licensed victuallers also men for whom Christ died?

Rev. W. BARKER, of West Cowes, Chaplain to the Queen.

I THINK it is very refreshing when any gentleman of the standing of Canon Harper has the courage of his opinions, and I agree with many remarks that have fallen from him, though I am a teetotaler. But that gentleman forgets that no man lives to himself. In the abstract, beer may be a good thing, and wine nice to drink: but that is not the question, it is—what are we to do in the present distress? If Canon Harper could get every man to think as he thinks, and to be master of his passions as he is master of his, then all would keep themselves within the limits of moderation and there would be at once no further necessity for temperance organisation. But we have to face the fact that there is drunkenness abroad, and we ask this question: What are the best means of meeting this difficulty? This is not an occasion on which to throw cold water upon enthusiasm; for what is wanted in regard to the temperance movement is a paroxysm of love, such a paroxysm as St. Paul was carried away with when he said, "If wine make my brother to offend, I will drink no wine as long as the world stands, lest I make my brother to offend," "It were better," said our Lord, "that a millstone were hanged about our neck, and that we were drowned in the depths of the sea, than that we should offend one of his little ones." This is a question affecting very often the very salvation of a man, and St. Paul realized this. He did not say that drinking wine was necessarily wrong in itself, yet, if it imperilled the safety of a fellow man for whom Christ died, the duty of a Christian was plain; the law of love in his case rising above the law of mere personal liberty. Our friend Mr. Aspinall spoke

with reference to the present law, and appeared to me to be slyly aiming his remarks at the paper of Canon Wilberforce which has just been read. The paper of the Canon was at least clear and definite: he advocated total abstinence for the individual and restriction by the State. I listened attentively to what the learned coroner would say, and I expected he would throw a flood of new light on the great legislative aspect of the question; but his remarks only amounted to this, that the law after all is not so bad as it is represented, and that daily it is being administered with more care and circumspection. How then does it come to pass that with the law so good, and with the administration of its daily approaching perfection, drunkenness is upon the increase, and the drink bill mounts up to fabulous millions; that though 400 Acts of Parliament upon this subject adorn the Statute Book, yet almost yearly new ones are being added, and a vast organization exists ceaselessly agitating for the alteration of the law—the law good and improvingly well administered? How can it be? When at Saltaire for instance, a town which owes its existence to the munificence and philanthropy of the late Sir Titus Salt, built for the moral improvement of his thousands of working people without a single public-house in it to corrupt them, the law, notwithstanding the most strenuous efforts on the part of Sir Titus to prevent it,—allowed a licence to be granted to a public-house immediately opposite this model town. The effect has been that much of the good which Sir Titus spent thousands of pounds to bring about, has been neutralized and undone. How can the law be said to be in a satisfactory state, when there is an appeal from the licensing magistrates, who know something perhaps about local requirement, to Quarter Sessions which know less, and then to the Queen's Bench which knows nothing? Numerous instances could be given of these appeals being successful, and of licences which had been refused, re-granted, to the annoyance of the localities. I say that the licensing law as it now exists is fighting against the temperance work in this country. A great deal has been said during this discussion about this question being a great religious question, as it undoubtedly is; but it is a great political question also: and till the people themselves grapple with this great question, and raise it to a prominent place in their political creed, influencing the elections, bringing Members of Parliament and would-be Members to see that temperance legislation must form an important part in the social reforms of the future, we shall never cure drunkenness. We don't want imperial coercive legislation. I am therefore opposed to the principle of shutting up by imperial enactment the public-house of the country upon Sunday, or any other day; though no one longs to free the Lord's day from the desecration of drunkenness more than I do. This is a matter for the people to settle for themselves. We have no right against their will to deprive them of a luxury to which they have been accustomed. But if the majority of the people in a district, and that the most respectable portion of it, and composed largely of the working classes themselves, are willing to go without this luxury, who is to complain? They have the right to carry out their wishes in this respect, if they so choose. Sir Wilfrid Lawson by the Permissive Bill proposes to give the people this power of ridding themselves of the public-house nuisance if they wish. But public opinion is not ripe for this measure, everyone cries out. All attempts at legislation ahead of public opinion, are of course doomed to failure. But who proposes such a course? It is not everywhere clearly understood that *Permissive Legislation* does not require popular adhesion and support. You might pass as many Permissive Acts to-morrow as you liked, and would hurt no one, simply because they would be dead letters unless the people themselves put the living spirit of their popular consent into them; then they would stand upon their legs and walk, and neither a man nor an aggregate of men called a community can complain against their

own deliberate acts. The Permissive Bill, therefore, of Sir Wilfrid Lawson, if it became an Act to-morrow, would be harmless in Sheffield, unless the people of Sheffield were wise enough to embrace the opportunity which would be given them to rid themselves of the greatest source of crime, pauperism and immorality in their great town. We simply maintain that since the people themselves are the chief sufferers from the drink traffic, they ought to be possessed with the power of ridding themselves of it, if they are so disposed. And because the afore-mentioned Bill proposes to invest them with this power, it is entitled in my opinion to the support of all earnest and thorough-going temperance reformers. I will conclude with these remarks—I thank God that I ever put my hand to this temperance work. It has been the means of great blessing to my people. I have pledged to the principles of total abstinence, in a place numbering 6500 people, over 350 men and women, besides 400 children; I can look upon homes, once desolate and sad through intemperance—now bright and happy; I see Sunday by Sunday, men and women worshipping in my Church, who were once victims to drink. By the blessing of God we will persevere in this work, and pray that the curse of drunkenness may be wholly removed from our town. Let us go forth in this great battle filled with enthusiasm for souls, inspired with the love of God and Christ, determined to contend bravely till victory is won and temperance reigns. Men and brethren, what have you done in this noble work to save a brother from death, a soul from hell? Will you be unwilling to sacrifice anything for your weaker brother's sake? Will you permit personal gratification,—the mere pleasurable titillation of a sense—to stand for a single instant in the way of Christian duty, and perhaps another's blessing? Let a common love for our common Lord—a common sympathy for our common humanity—let wealth, intelligence, and enthusiasm—let high self-sacrifice and Christian zeal fuse into a generous heat the hearts of us all, that we may go forth with divine love to rescue the drunkard, save the wretched, raise the fallen, and banish from our land this curse which is polluting and poisoning the very fresh springs of our natural life. This is an assembly composed of ladies and gentlemen possessing wide influence, and occupying, some of you, high social rank—I appeal to you earnestly and lovingly to give up something, to do something in this cause. You can help mightily this work: what will you do? If each individual would lay it upon his conscience that there is a duty to be done, here is work to be achieved. Oh, what blessed results might flow from this Congress meeting! I do cry to you not to keep aloof from this movement, nor to remain lukewarm or indifferent. Help right heartily this crusade against sin and shame. God is on our side, the side of truth and temperance. The day must soon dawn upon us when the banner of temperance shall wave in every corner of England, and our land shall be free and sober too. Happy, thrice happy, that day when drunkenness shall cease, and the wilderness left by it shall spring and blossom as the rose. The Church never did a more worthy work than when she formed herself into a great Temperance Society.

The Rev. W. MOORE-EDE, Sheffield.

It is with extreme diffidence that I rise to address this meeting, and I should not now venture to do so had I not been previously asked to read a paper on this subject. It seems to me, that though declamation is useful in its way, by attracting attention to the magnitude of the evil, and by helping to form a sound public

opinion on this subject, yet it leaves very much to be done in this matter. With regard to the remarks of Canon Harper, I would ask him whether we have not all known in our younger years men who have drunk beer with safety for a time, and who have, nevertheless, been in later years stricken down and slain by the demon drink. I think I may safely say that there is not one person here present who has not lost some near relative or much valued friend, by this terrible enemy—that there is not one of us, who, looking round the circle of our friends in years gone by, does not perceive gaps in the once happy circle, gaps caused by drink. Though public opinion may have, and does have, a powerful effect upon the drunken lord, it has, as yet, comparatively little influence on the drunken mechanic. Nor is this to be wondered at, if we look at the men and consider what means they have of amusing themselves. Supposing they are mechanics in a large town, mere lodgers perhaps, in homes where they feel themselves to be in the way, or workmen with large families, how glad such men must be to remove themselves out of the way of the unpleasant process of washing day: but where can they go? The only places they can find outside their homes are the public-houses or the dancing saloons. In considering this question we ought ever to keep in mind the saying of the American humourist, that “there is a good deal of human nature in man;” and we ought to try and study this human nature, and consult a man’s wants, his likes and dislikes, and give him the benefit of those agencies which will keep him out of the way of that demon which is destroying so many of our noblest and our best. The sailors of our navy have given a very appropriate name to an Institution established by Miss Weston, whose name is so well-known for the work she has done among the sailors of our navy. It is called the Sailor’s Rest, and is in all respects fitted up like a public-house, but no drink is supplied—the sailors call it “the Three C’s”—by which they mean coffee, comfort, and company. We ought, as far as we can, to supply the “the Three C’s” for the masses of the people. We must go further than that, and bear in mind the very good advice that Pope Gregory the Great gave to St. Augustine, not to set aside all the customs he found existing in England as bad and pernicious, but to pick the streak of sin out of them and consecrate and purify them from the service of the devil. We ought, in like manner, to study the wants and likings of the masses of the people; to study their manners and customs, and endeavour to utilise them and purify them; and until we can offer them “the Three C’s” by supplying them with cocoa-houses and with innocent and attractive amusements, such as are suited to their tastes, we shall not find much good resulting from our declamations and temperance meetings; unless we provide counter-attractions to the public-house and music hall, our preachings and meetings will have very little practical use and very little practical effect.

REV. W. ROBINSON.

I wish to call the attention of this meeting to a phase of the temperance question, which is of great importance, and which, I trust, will again engage the attention of the House of Commons in the next session of Parliament—the Sunday Closing of Public Houses.

It has been said by one of our greatest statesmen that the laws of this country “ought so to be framed, that men may with ease do what is right, and with difficulty do what is wrong.” But with the public-houses and gin-palaces open on the day in which working men have most leisure, and a large portion of their wages in their pocket—open not only to welcome all who enter, but to tempt in passers by, large

numbers find it difficult to do what is right, and with ease do what is wrong. By large numbers the day which God has given to us for the highest and holiest of purposes is spent in sinful idleness, in revelry and drunkenness.

I have in my possession the annual report of the Chief Constables of several large towns, from which it appears that the largest amount of drunkenness takes place on Saturday, and that Sunday stands next in the list, although on Sunday public-houses are only open six hours, whilst on other days of the week they are open seventeen hours. In his evidence before the Lords' Committee on Intemperance Major Bond, the Chief Constable of Birmingham, says, "Saturday, Sunday, and Monday, are the three drunken days."

To the Sunday open public-house we may attribute the habitual absence of large numbers of the working classes from the house of God on that day. On this subject Mr. Oglethorpe, the Chief Constable of Preston, has given his opinion in the following words:—"As a rule, the public-houses open at six on Sunday, the places of worship at half-past six, and there is no doubt that persons are attracted to public-houses who would otherwise go to some place of worship."

I suppose there can be no doubt that the late drinking on Saturday nights, followed by the traffic on Sundays, gives an impetus to the drinking on the Monday, the results being that the masters and foremen of many works experience great inconvenience, and suffer loss from their men not returning to work on a Monday.

The Bill framed and promoted by the Central Association, of which his Grace the chairman is a vice-president, and by which, if it became law, the sale of intoxicating liquors would be stopped during the whole of Sunday, except to lodgers in hotels, and *bonâ fide* travellers, would, we feel confident, diminish to a large extent if not completely put an end to the evils of which I have spoken. We are encouraged to persevere in the promotion of this measure, among other reasons, because it is found from practical experience that the stoppage of the liquor traffic on Sunday leads to a decrease of intemperance, and conduces to the quiet and order of the day. After a gallant struggle, in which our Irish friends displayed a courage and perseverance which we, on this side of the Channel, will do well to imitate, the Sunday Closing Bill for Ireland has received the Royal assent, and will come into operation on Sunday, October 13th; but I desire to remind this meeting that, owing to the action and influence of Roman Catholic Bishops, the Sunday Closing of public-houses has been faithfully observed in certain parts of Ireland for many years. Of the result, the Archbishop of Cashel thus writes:—"The improvement we have made in this diocese, put to a twelve years' trial, has, thank God, exceeded my most sanguine expectations. A drunken man is rarely to be seen amongst us. Sunday rioting and blaspheming, which before prevailed to a lamentable extent, have ceased to desecrate our Sunday and disgrace our towns." The following is the testimony of Dr. Furlong, Bishop of Ferns:—"I can say, with perfect truth, that the calm and absence of all disturbance and disorder which prevails in this diocese on the Sabbath is a result of Sunday closing, for which we have reason to be thankful to Providence."

In Scotland, the liquor traffic on Sunday has been prohibited by law since 1854. During the passage of the Irish Sunday Closing Bill through the House of Commons, it was frequently said by Members opposed to the measure that the Forbes Mackenzie Act had proved a failure in Scotland, an assertion much more easily made than proved.

In consequence of these assertions, I beg the attention of this meeting to the following statement as to the beneficial operation of the Act, furnished by persons well qualified to speak on this subject. In his report, Mr. Thomas Linton, who has

been Chief Constable of Edinburgh for twenty-seven years, and a member of that police force for forty years, furnishes the following statistics:—

In 1852 the number of persons apprehended in Edinburgh as drunk and incapable during six days of the week, were	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6367
In 1876	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1131
In 1852 the number of such cases between eight on Sunday morning and eight on Monday morning	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	401
In 1876	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	77
In 1852 the Monday drunken cases numbered	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	776
In 1876	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	265
In 1852 the Saturday drunken cases were	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1317
In 1876	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	659
Between the years 1862 and 1876 the population of Edinburgh increased 51,000.								

From the reports of Mr. A. McCall, who for seven years has been Chief Constable of Glasgow, and for twenty-seven years a member of that police force, I have obtained the following information:—

In the three years immediately preceding the passing of the Forbes Mackenzie Act, from

1851 to 1854 the number of drunken cases in Glasgow during six days of the week were	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	66,993
1854 to 1857 the first three years after the Act was passed	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	53,775
								<u>13,228</u>
From 1851 to 1854 the Sunday drunken cases were	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4,082
From 1854 to 1857	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1,466
								<u>2,616</u>

In the years 1851-52-53 the average number of apprehensions for drunkenness on Sunday was 26. In 1877 the average number was $7\frac{1}{4}$, which, says Mr. McCall, is not large over an area of $9\frac{1}{4}$ miles, and out of a population of 550,000, being an increase over the population of 1852 of 200,000. The population of Glasgow includes 76,000 Irish. The Forbes Mackenzie Act has, we are told, led to a much larger amount of private drinking in illicit houses called shebeens. Mr. McCall tells us that in Glasgow the number of such houses has decreased 215 since 1858. In his evidence before the House of Commons' Committee on the Irish Sunday Closing Bill, Mr. McCall says:—"My experience of the effects of Sunday Closing in Glasgow has been, that there has been a wonderful change wrought upon the peace and quiet of the city since the public-houses were closed on the Sunday. It is a very rare thing to see the people going about the streets drunk on the Sunday from six o'clock in the morning till twelve o'clock at night, whereas before the public-houses were closed it was very common. The opinion of Glasgow is, that the Act has done an immense deal of good, and that to speak of repealing or altering it, so as to give liberty for drinking on the Sunday, the people of Glasgow would not submit to it for a single moment. Prior to the passing of the Forbes Mackenzie Act, masters and foremen of works experienced great difficulty with regard to their men returning to work on Monday. I hear no complaint on that point now."

During the past year the Central Association has held upwards of 200 meetings in various parts of the country, and conducted a house-to-house canvass in many towns and villages, and the votes recorded show that a very large majority of the working classes desire to have the temptation to Sunday drinking removed by the

operation of a Sunday Closing Act. As an indication of public opinion upon this subject I will give to this meeting the result of the householders canvass in Liverpool:—

For entire Sunday Closing	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	44,061
Against	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	8,542
Majority	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	<u>35,519</u>

Let there be a combination of temperance organisations, and a concentration of Christian effort upon this matter, and ere long, with God's blessing on our labours, we shall see the worst of trades suspended on the best of days, and the English Sunday become more like what God would have the Sabbath everywhere to be—the holiest, happiest, and most peaceful of days.

79.82

CUTLERS' HALL, WEDNESDAY MORNING.

OCTOBER 2nd, 1878.

The Right Reverend the LORD BISHOP OF RIPON took the chair
at 10 A.M.

THE CHURCH: ITS PROPERTY, ENDOWMENTS, AND REVENUES IN RELATION TO THE STATE.

PAPERS.

Rev. A. GATTY, D.D.

It must at once be understood that the Church, about which I am going to discourse, is that visible historical institution, which, by its alliance with the State, constitutionally proclaims that we are a Christian people (from the ruling sovereign to the youngest infant that is brought to the font for baptism), and that there is a defined religious society established within this realm of England, which offers the sacraments and ordinances prescribed by the gospel to every inhabitant of the land.

I am not for one moment pretending to claim for the Church an exclusive road to eternal life; for God, "who sees with other, larger eyes than ours," will reward every man according to his opportunities and worth.

I am dealing with *facts*, and not with the motions of individual conscience; and it cannot be denied that every country has always had some acknowledged form of religious faith, and therefore that the spread of Christianity has always encountered in its progress some already existing creed. A defined national faith is the rule of all countries.

A community feels, no less than a single member of it, that there is a higher Power than kings and rulers of the earth, and therefore a National Church is the natural exponent of this general conviction.

That the Church of England is no creation of the State is undeniable, because it is much the older institution. There were bishops, priests, and deacons ministering to the people long before the constitution of King, Lords, and Commons came into being, or mayors and aldermen were heard of; and if kings were the first patrons of the Church, their subjects were willing converts to their examples: and whenever the Church of Christ displaced a previous false religion, the revenues and temples of the heathen have been, in some measure, transferred with the faith of the people.

As a *religious* society, the Church is impregnable: neither disestablishment nor disendowment could suppress it. The clergy would hold their sacred orders independently of the State; and the loss of their present endowments would neither disperse their followers, nor stifle their ministrations.

It is no easy matter to define the connection betwixt Church and State. The Church is so exclusively the purveyor of good to the people—"peace on earth and goodwill towards men,"—that the State has ever found it the strongest bulwark of support and defence; and throughout every change of dynasty and political revolution, its purpose has been respected and its revenues preserved.

The Church cannot be said to be in subjection to the State, for the sovereign at his coronation has to own himself to be in communion with the Church of England, and must take "an oath to maintain and preserve inviolably the settlement of the Church of England, and the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government thereof, as by law established."

The Queen, therefore, though "Supreme Governor" of the Church—(a title which Queen Elizabeth adopted for herself and successors—rather than "Head of the Church," which Henry VIII. assumed from the Pope, when he threw off his allegiance to Rome)—the Queen, I say, acknowledges the Church's "power to decree rites or ceremonies, and to hold authority in controversies of faith"—the State, of course, having already sanctioned the uniformity of public worship; and being always at liberty to repudiate all connection with ministrations that may have become abused.

The admission of bishops into the House of Peers, is an example of the alliance betwixt the temporal and spiritual authorities; and that Convocation is assembled by a writ from the Crown, like Parliament itself, shows harmonious action in these two estates of the realm.

As citizens, the clergy are subject, like their fellow-subjects, to the civil law; but they have their own Courts, with Judges and chancellors, paid out of their own revenues, for the arbitration of all ecclesiastical causes. The State guards and may allot the revenues and estates of the clergy at the will of the Legislature, but has no claim whatever upon such possessions as ever having been *national property*.

The clergy are constantly reproached by some Nonconformists for

not relying on what they call "the voluntary system" for their maintenance, to which I reply, that we entirely subsist upon what has been voluntarily given.

Their word "voluntary" should be exchanged for "eleemosynary;" for what they recommend for our support, is a persistent appeal by offertories to our congregations.

Now, I have no doubt that there is at least no stronger exercise of a free will in the giver when personally urged to contribute, than when the possessor of property, left to himself, did considerably and gratefully bestow on the clergy the lands and tithes which now form the endowments of their benefices.

The whole property of which the clergy are possessed is the result of a real "voluntary system;" and it has been *corporate property* sole or aggregate from the beginning. Not a shilling of it ever came out of the national exchequer.

The Ecclesiastical Commissioners, the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, the deans and chapters of the various cathedrals, and every beneficed clergyman, are each and all *corporations*; holding estates, with certain duties annexed to the possession of them.

The Ecclesiastical Commissioners, created about forty years ago, and consisting of bishops and laymen, have been empowered to take the episcopal and cathedral properties into their management, and to redistribute the proceeds to a better and increased service of the Church. The cost of this arrangement is met by the income from Church property.

The Bounty of Queen Anne was merely a restoration to the clergy of the first fruits of their livings—the first year's income, in fact, at the time of the Reformation, when Henry VIII. appropriated what the Pope had previously claimed—and the Royal generosity of this Queen has since been applied to the improvement of small livings.

Deans and chapters are *corporations aggregate*; and every clergyman holding a living, of which there are about 14,473, is a *corporation sole*.

All these corporations are legally capable of holding property; but they are no more allowed to waste it, than is the life owner of an entailed estate to sell, or give away, what must go to his heir.

For the foundation of the Church in England, we must go back to apostolic times, and then be lost in vain search for any date. But it is not altogether improbable, that St. Paul himself may have sown the first seed of Christianity in Britain.

At any rate, in the third century, it had made sufficient progress amongst the people to cause the persecution by Diocletian to extend to this island; and British bishops attended the European Councils of the Church that were held towards the beginning of the fourth century,

The Romans, who then occupied our island, would favour their converted Emperor's faith; but, being recalled in 426 for the defence of Rome against the Goths, in 449 the heathen Saxons from the mouth of the Elbe subdued and slaughtered the British, who had been left unprotected, and drove the remnants of their Church into

the mountains of Wales. It was nevertheless not totally extinguished, as we know from the controversy which took place on the arrival of Augustine from Rome, in 596; after which date, we may consider that the Church of England was permanently *established*.

What was done for Augustine, who became first Bishop of Canterbury, by Ethelbert, King of Kent, and *Bretwalda*, or "Lord of Britain," was followed by the other Saxon Kings, as they in turn became converted, with their subjects. Each Saxon kingdom in time had its bishop, whose diocese was coterminous with the realm, and to whom the King presented a large tract of land, which had then little value, when a cathedral and college for the clergy were built upon it, for as yet there were no parishes. The grants thus made by these kings were from the Crown lands which they privately owned.

It is commonly said that Ethelwulf, King of the West Saxons, made the first grant of tithes in 855; but Sharon Turner says there are three charters in existence which refer to this grant—that they all differ, and he himself thinks that the King conferred additional land, and not tithe at all. At any rate, tithes are mentioned in 750 by both Egbert and Cuthbert, Bishops of Canterbury and York, which shows that they had been previously paid; and the King probably did no more than confer a civil power of enforcing them.

We know that the payment of tithes was long anterior to Christianity. Abraham and Jacob paid them before Moses ordered them. Greeks, Romans, and other heathen nations did the same; and when a people became Christian they would naturally continue to the clergy what they had before paid to the Pagan priest.

The origin of tithes is so ancient as to be beyond the reach of all historical research. No lawyer has ever been able to ascertain how they commenced, or to decide whether, by statute or common law, they became part of the general law of the land. They originated, I believe, *jure divino*, in the law of God written on the heart of man.

The desire to dedicate a tenth part of your income to works of piety and charity appears to have been a natural sentiment, consonant with human feelings in primitive times, like the acknowledgment of a God or the observance of one day in seven as a day of rest.

In the early times of Christianity, the clergy dispensed assistance and relief to the ignorant, the needy, the sick, the aged, the wayfarer—to the fatherless children and widows, and all who were desolate and oppressed; and therefore a full tenth of the produce of the soil was no unreasonable payment to the communities of the religious, for such unlimited exercise of benefaction and hospitality.

At the same time it must be understood that, although the land of England was liable to be tithed, only that portion of it was subject to this duty which the owner had voluntarily yielded.

Tithe is sometimes spoken of as an impost on the soil, emanating in old times from an order of the State. A quotation from William Earl of Warren's foundation charter to Lewes Priory, in Sussex, will sufficiently illustrate the fact that tithes were a private gift of the owner of the property. The charter, dated in 1077, runs thus:—

“Decimas quoque terrarum mearum, et illas nominatim quas Richardus presbyter tenet et tenebit in vitâ suâ—ita quod post mortem ejus monachis remanebunt—concessionem etiam feci decimarum quas homines mei ibi dederunt, vel postea daturi sunt.”

Nothing can be clearer than that this was the free act of a private owner, doing what he would with his own—reserving, indeed, a life interest for Richard, the priest, who seems to have been the chaplain serving the church on the estate; but at his death, together with the tithes of other lands belonging to the Earl, they were to go to the monks of the religious house which De Warren then founded.

The example set by the Saxon kings in endowing the bishops with lands for the support of the cathedral establishments, and the monasteries, or houses of the religious (which were of very early institution, and a necessity of the times), was followed by the earls and thanes when Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury, *cir.* 669, acting under a law of the Emperor Justinian, converted the various manors throughout the country into parishes; and the chaplains of the proprietors assumed the office of parish priests.

“Theodore,” says Dean Hook, “persuaded the thanes and landed proprietors to assign to their former chaplains an independent position, and by placing a church in the centre of their estates, to secure a constant intercourse between the minister of the gospel, the inmates of the castle, and the serfs.” “In spite,” says Professor Blunt, “of the various independent kingdoms into which England was divided, the universal Church of England submitted to Theodore’s authority and plan.”

I need not dilate on the union and co-operation of Church and State, which have resulted from the parochial system, and for which the country is solely indebted to the action of the Church; and this wise and convenient distribution entailing local management is a blessing to the people at this day.

William of Normandy, the Conqueror, must have recognised at once, with his vigorous understanding, that the clergy had been the civilisers of a barbarous nation; for law and order, education and manners, were exclusively theirs. They had not only introduced Christian morals, and made their monastic establishments places of refuge from the violence and ignorance of the outside world; but they had also been the great cultivators of the soil, draining marshes, clearing forests, and bringing wastes into a condition which added to the means of subsistence and the higher comforts of life.

The Conqueror recognised all this; and when he took possession of the country, and handled the estates of the Saxon nobility at his will—as despotic owner of the soil—he issued a stern mandate for the restoration of all the Church lands, which his Norman followers had appropriated. The whole glebe was thus confirmed to the clergy, which private benefaction had before bestowed.

It was at this time that the Church of England first felt the encroachments of Rome. The title of “Universal Bishop” had been repudiated by Pope Gregory: the Anglo-Saxon clergy were allowed to marry: the Holy Scriptures were the rule of faith: the

doctrine of Transubstantiation was as yet unknown. But Pope Hildebrand had no intention of leaving the English Church thus independent; and he demanded homage from the Conqueror for his kingdom. The reply was short and decisive:—"Fidelitatem facere nolui nec volo, quia non ego promisi, nec antecessores meos antecessoribus tuis id fecisse comperio."

Here is sufficient testimony that obedience to the Pope of Rome had never been yielded by the Anglo-Saxon Church.

For nearly 300 years, however, the encroachments of the successive Popes grew and extended over this Church and country, assisted no doubt by the infusion of Norman settlers, who drew large revenues from English Church property for the support of ecclesiastical establishments in their own land.

This, nevertheless, was checked by the robust policy of Edward III., who enacted his famous "Statute of Provisors," which made it penal to procure presentations to benefices from the Court of Rome, and secured the rights of patrons which the Pope had encroached upon. Any appeal to Rome, in a disputed cause, was also made punishable by outlawry.

At this period the Reformation began to dawn. Wycliffe translated the Scriptures, and declared them to be the only one rule of faith; and Chaucer derided the immoral lives of the begging friars in his satirical poems; and as both of them wrote in plain English, the understandings of the people were so far enlightened, that, when the Reformation came it was accepted without a necessity for the stake and fires of Smithfield.

The common objection that Henry VIII. was morally unfit, as an instrument of religious purification, is met by the fact that he was at least no worse than many Popes, and it was only the temporalities of the Church which he arbitrarily seized.

These, no doubt, had been unduly accumulated during the middle ages, when the highest offices of the State were held by the clergy, as the only competent persons; and since indulgences during life and expiations after death were made marketable wares, it was not difficult to enrich monasteries and found chantries at the expense of those who were conscious at death of their past bad lives.

At the dissolution of the monasteries, all this ill-got property was swept away, and, together with it manors and tithes, which had been appropriated by the Abbeyes, were awarded by the unscrupulous King to his favourites, who were the first lay impropiators.

The Church of England, at the present time, holds no questionable endowments, acquired on the representations of the mediæval clergy. What the Church possesses has arisen from the endowments of the Anglo-Saxon period, together with what has been added since the Reformation.

The parochial system was respected by Henry VIII., as it had been by the Conqueror, and as it was also by Queen Mary, who would have reversed the religion of the country; and even by Oliver Cromwell, though he succeeded in driving 7,000 clergy from their livings, because he determined to introduce the Presbyterian discipline.

With all the liberty of conscience, for which the people have striven since the Scriptures have been open to everyone who could read, the Church has hitherto maintained a standard of faith and doctrine, and has striven, by missionary effort, to extend this blessing throughout the vast Colonial possessions of which she has the guardianship.

The Church endowments have been, from time to time, regulated by “*modus*,” and otherwise, and fitted to the Providential circumstances which have arisen; but, whilst the law has repeatedly escheated to the Crown the estates of offending laymen, neither the iron hand of William the Conqueror, nor that of Oliver Cromwell, has ever molested its voluntary endowments.

The doctrine, too, of the Reformation has been spared, though often attacked by those who have quitted the pale of the Establishment, or who are restive under its requirements; and, as a National Church, it has hitherto survived.

Nor can any one predict what would ensue to the State were the Church to be detached from it. Like other old countries of Christendom, we have still an authorised form of worship, to which the Throne vows submission, and to which all the people may come; and the potentates, who visit us from the East, for lessons in civilisation, have hitherto witnessed this outward expression of unity in our faith. But the labours of the missionary in their heathen lands would be greatly impeded were the Mahometan or Brahmin, whom he would convert, able to say, “You have disestablished your Church, which you tell us was founded 1,300 years ago. This act shows that you have yourselves no faith in it. We will hold to our own religion.”

But surely Churchmen are too strong and numerous to allow such a surrender. The original voluntary system in the Church of England, which for the last forty years has contributed about one million a year on the average, is still sufficiently alive and able to protect its doctrine, and support its teachers; and the Establishment, which has ever proved the strongest bulwark to the State, without costing it one penny, cannot be discarded without shaking to its foundation that British Constitution of which, as patriots, we are so justly proud.

MR. HUGH BIRLEY, M.P.

Six years ago, Mr. Miall, Member for Bradford, made the following motion in the House of Commons:—

“That an humble address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty that by means of a royal commission, full and minute particulars may be procured of the origin, nature, amount and application of any property and revenues appropriated to the use of the Church of England.”

In the course of his reply, Mr. Gladstone, then Prime Minister, observed—

"I did not gather from his speech at what period in the chronology of the human race he proposes to commence his enquiry. Perhaps he would be satisfied with Melchisedec, one of the highest authorities from whom the history may be traced."

This extract from Hansard may serve to show the possible extent of the comprehensive subject with which I have to deal in twenty minutes, and which would tax the ability of an accomplished antiquarian or jurist.

It has been assigned to me, I conceive, as representing average members of the House of Commons, an assembly which may hereafter be invited to deal with Church Endowments in a hostile spirit.

This point of view suggests a controversial essay; but desiring to avoid controversy as far as possible, I have decided to offer a practical illustration of the relations of the Church to the State in regard to its property and its revenues, as my principal contribution to the subject under discussion.

The ancient parish of Manchester is the example selected. I shall not go back to the era of Melchisedec, but take Domesday Book, compiled A.D. 1080-86—an authentic and invaluable document, as my basis; and the following sketch is mainly condensed from the History of the Foundations of Manchester, by Dr. Hibbert Ware.

In Domesday Book we read "King Edward held Salford. The church of St. Mary and the church of St. Michael held in Manchester one carucate of land, free from all customs but the gelt."

Albert Greslet, mentioned in Domesday Book, was the first of the eight lords of Manchester in succession of that house, A.D. 1080—1309. No doubt he obtained the Manor of Manchester and the advowson of its churches from his patron Roger de Poitou. His descendant, Albert Senex, in the reign of Henry II., granted to the church in Manchester four ox-gangs of his domain; and Thomas Greslet, A.D. 1309, the last baron of the family, made a formal grant of the advowson to John la Warre and Joan his wife (the sister of Greslet), subject to a yearly payment to himself during his life of 100 marks. A.D. 1398, Thomas la Warre, a priest, became rector and lord of Manchester. In 1421, he collegiate the church—a memorable event which deserves to be described in some detail.

Desiring to put into execution this pious intention, his parishioners were assembled at the sound of the bell. There were present the two churchwardens, two knights, several esquires, and many others of the rank of gentlemen. To this assembly he represented that the parish of Manchester had become large and populous, and that some of the former rectors were seldom residents in it, whilst others had absented themselves altogether. He therefore pleaded that for the greater honour of the town and the better edification of the inhabitants, a college and collegiate church, calculated for a warden and such a number of associate priests or fellows as the Bishops of Durham and Lichfield might appoint, should be founded and endowed. He offered at his own charge to erect the costly buildings that would be required, but he also recommended that in further aid of the purpose and for the permanent support of the college, the parishioners should, for themselves, their heirs and successors, give

their free assent to the appropriation of the estates attached to the existing rectory; and as additional funds would still be needed, the covener promised that the deficiency should be supplied from certain lands which he himself possessed in the lordship of Manchester.

To this proposition the parishioners gave their free consent; and the mutual agreement being drawn up in writing, was ratified with the signet of the Dean of Manchester, and with more than twenty other seals of individuals of rank.

Immediately afterwards a charter for the college was obtained from the Crown, in the ninth year of the reign of Henry V.

In the Preamble of the Charter of Incorporation (A.D. 1421), it is stated — "*Ecclesia de Manchestre largam et amplam habens parochiam, et multum populosam, temporibus retrocitis per rectores consueverat regi et guhernari, quorum aliqui nunquam, aliqui perraro personaliter residere curarunt in eâdem.*"

Dr. Hibbert here is of opinion that in founding the Collegiate Church, Thomas la Warre was much influenced by Wycliffe's severe denunciations of non-residence, and in some degree made common cause with the Reformer. For this surmise however there is no certain warrant; it rests mainly on the fact that some of Wycliffe's principal advocates were relatives or friends of the La Warres, and that the new foundation in Manchester was calculated to support his precepts in this respect. It must be noted also that Thomas la Warre was himself a pluralist on an extensive scale.

The college consisted of the warden, two parish priests, two canons and four deacons, to whom were attached four clerks and six choristers.

The first warden was presented by the founder. The baron's hall was demolished, and the structure of the college raised upon its site.

The church seems to have been originally constructed of wood, the funds bequeathed by De la Warre being mainly appropriated to the college. The transformation of the structure to the stone edifice substantially as it existed thirty years ago, was the work of successive contributors, lay and clerical, during the 15th century, among whom the well-known names of Stanley, West, Radcliffe, Byron, conspicuously appear.

The Collegiate Church of Manchester fortunately escaped spoliation in the reign of Henry VIII., but in the first year of Edward VI. (A.D. 1547), an Act of Parliament was passed dissolving the college, and the college house together with some of the lands were taken into the king's possession and demised to the Earl of Derby, who provided three or four ministers to supply the service of the Church while it remained in this state. It is said that the college was turned into a vicarage.

Queen Mary (A.D. 1554-55) re-founded the college, and confirmed the statutes of the first foundation.

Early in the reign of Elizabeth it was deemed fit by the Queen's Council that the ecclesiastical foundation of Manchester should be rendered subservient to the purpose (as Strype the historian expresses it) of expelling Popish darkness and disposing the people to receive

the gospel. The lands and revenues of the College were therefore deemed to be under the control of the Crown, while the Archbishop of York was entrusted with the special care of making such alterations in its constitution as were calculated to answer the ends which the Government had in view.

Under this superintendence the College of Manchester had an importance given to it which it had never before experienced. "It maintained," says Strype, "godly preachers. Young men were instructed in it for the duties of the ministry; and to add to the dignity of the establishment, it was ordered that the tithe corn and the small tithes accruing to Manchester Church should be reserved by the warden and fellows for the maintenance of hospitality and for the relief of the poor."

Such was the new constitution of the College, which was now no longer the College of Manchester, but the College of Lancashire and all the adjoining counties. In the language of Strype, "a noble and useful foundation for learning and propagation of religion in those northern parts."

In connection with these regulations the Archbishop issued injunctions to the warden and fellows concerning their residence, and diligent and constant preaching every Sunday in the Church of Manchester or one of the chapels in the parish.

It is worthy of notice that the charter of Elizabeth, in referring to the College as re-founded by Mary, makes no change whatever in the religious character of the institution. The charter mentions the daily prayers solemnly said, the sacrament and other divine exercises celebrated, the parishioners instructed in all true Christian piety, in loyal obedience and honest conversation, as though the Reformation had never been heard of, and it is an apt illustration of the continuity of the National Church.

In the reign of Charles I. a new charter was granted to the College (A.D. 1635), to remedy abuses and enforce discipline by more stringent regulations.

Though the history of the Church in Manchester during the Commonwealth is full of interest, it need not detain us long. The warden and others of the clergy inclined to Puritanism, ultimately accepted the national covenant, and from A.D. 1646 to 1660 the Collegiate Church became subject to Presbyterian government and forms of worship. The revenues of the College had been seized by the Parliamentary sequestrators, but were subsequently restored.

The Presbyterians however experienced great difficulty in enforcing their discipline, alike from the opposition of Episcopalians and Independents, and were also much vexed by internal dissensions.

At the Restoration, Episcopalian church government replaced the Presbyterian form, and remained unchanged till the order in council, A.D. 1847, which elevated Manchester into a bishop's see, constituted the Collegiate Church a cathedral, and the warden and fellows, deans and canons. About the same time the revenues of the Chapter were definitely fixed, and the surplus appropriated to the augmentation of slender endowments within the ancient parish.

Here it may be useful to notice the progress of Church exten-

sion in the ancient parish of Manchester. At the Reformation (A.D. 1535), there were nine churches, including one or two which should possibly be dated at a later period in the century. Fifty years ago, when the late Bishop Sumner entered upon his office he found twenty-seven churches. His active episcopate added twenty-three churches in twenty years, and the first Bishop of Manchester consecrated thirty-five within twenty-two years. To these the present diocesan has already added sixteen, and others are in progress of erection. From nine to one hundred is indeed an advance, like the exchange of armour between Diomedes and Glaucus. About twenty places are also licensed by the Bishop for the celebration of divine worship.

Nor is this all: the college for the priests has indeed been alienated, and the substituted residences are no longer available; but nearly sixty parsonage houses have been erected, and substantial school buildings attached to almost every church.

The progress of population, however, plainly shows that performance lags far behind the need of Church extension within the boundaries of the ancient parish of Manchester.

Of the inhabitants when the Church was collegiate we have no census. The parish is said then to have been "very populous;" but as at the date of the charter of Elizabeth the estimated number is only 10,000, a very different idea must have been attached to the term "populous," than in the present day. By the census of 1871, the population enumerated is stated to be 602,902.

The area of the ancient parish was about 34,000 acres.

The length from north to south, about eight to nine miles.

The breadth from east to west, about seven to nine miles.

In thus endeavouring briefly to trace the annals of the Church in Manchester, I must call attention to the comparative immunity from violent outrage which she has enjoyed.

It will have been seen, however, that she was not free from State control in regard to her endowments; and that control was often unjustifiable, though it never led to disestablishment, and to disendowment only in a limited degree or for a very short period.

I must now endeavour to state concisely what, in my judgment, is the conclusion which should be deduced from precedents and the actual state of affairs.

The relation of the Church to the State in regard to the revenues and property of the former, is that the State, being the supreme temporal power, can re-distribute, alienate, or, if you prefer the expression, confiscate the property of the Church.

If the civil rights of the Church in this respect came to be argued in a Court of Law, there can, I imagine, be no reasonable doubt that her tenure is as sound and substantial as any private property in the kingdom, and would be adjudged to be equally inviolable and secure.

The donors of land or money for Church purposes rely upon the good faith of the State to maintain the property so assigned to this great national Trust, with as much care and vigilance as any other Trust property, whether of a public or of a private character.

It may however be asked. What are the precedents for disendowment, or for stripping the Church of her property in any respect?

I answer, the precedents are countless. Through good report and evil report, in Papal and in Protestant times, by laymen and by ecclesiastics, by the State and by private persons, the property of the Church has been seized and appropriated, sometimes with, more frequently without, plausible pleas or excuses.

All readers of history know that our Norman kings often kept bishoprics vacant, and applied the revenues to their own use.

Before the close of the 11th century, we find various complaints of the sale of churches by laymen, clerks, and monks; and consequently a variety of injunctions that no layman shall have any part of the altar offerings, or fees for burial, or the third part of the tithes, or take money for the sale of them, or remove a priest from his living without consent of the bishop.

Again, A.D. 1173, children are not to be admitted to the cure of souls, nor laymen to take any portion of the Church's offerings, or appoint annual vicars, or deduct any part of the parson's tithe.

The Commons remonstrated to Richard II. that notwithstanding all the prohibitions of the laws of the land, the "religious," through their favour with the Pope, mischievously appropriated benefices having cure of souls, and grievously threw down the houses and edifices of the same to the ground, and carried them all away, usually taking away and destroying divine service, hospitality and other works of charity, which were accustomed to be done in the said benefices to the poor and maimed.

The enormous plunder that accrued to the Crown, to its retainers and favourites, including many noble families, by the suppression of the monasteries in the reign of Henry VIII. is familiar to all, and it is only necessary to notice here the consequent suffering of the clergy. Though the monasteries frequently owed their origin or at least their aggrandisement to the alienated revenues of the parochial benefices, some pittance usually reverted to the vicar. The dissolution of the monasteries themselves was of a more sweeping character.

As a matter of fact, I believe that the records of Church endowments from the earliest accessible dates to the reign of Henry VIII. show that they were in a constant state of flux and reflux—now augmented by the piety or superstition of testators and other benefactors, now plundered by the lords of dominant castles, or the monks of overshadowing abbeys. To these outrages must be added the irregular exactions of the Crown and of Parliament, to which the dissolution of the monasteries formed the climax. From that period to the reign of Queen Anne, whilst the poverty of the clergy became the frequent theme of complaint and remonstrance, no definite or well considered measure of relief seems to have been adopted.

The establishment of the Bounty Fund out of the restored first fruits and tenths of the Church was an important step in the right direction, and, like the subsequent measures initiated in 1835, drew

forth a considerable augmentation to clerical endowments from the laity and the wealthier clergy.

To the late Sir Robert Peel, in my judgment at least, the Church of England is more indebted than to any other modern statesman for the orderly and systematic development and distribution of her revenues. The evils, or rather the inconveniences, which accompanied his measures appear trivial when compared with their beneficial influences.

That the National Church may be maintained in the just but moderate exercise of her rights, and in the enjoyment of her revenues, and that she may with greatly augmented energy and devotion fulfil the sacred duties for which alone she claims to exist, must be the sincere prayer of all her loyal sons.

ADDRESSES.

MR. ARTHUR THOMAS, Sheffield.

AFTER the able descriptions which have been given by Dr. Gatty and Mr. Birley of the principles connected with the union of the Church and State, I will venture to ask your attention to the facts that are on the paper which has been placed in your hands, in relation to the Church in Sheffield. It will be found that the circumstances connected with the property of the Church in Sheffield carry out the principles which Dr. Gatty has enunciated—that Church property is not national property; that what she has, has been voluntarily given—and it will be found that what she has received from the national exchequer is, practically speaking, no exception from the principle of voluntarism. It will also be found that the funds of the Church are, in Sheffield, pretty nearly what Dr. Gatty has described: as property which was acquired in Anglo-Saxon days or immediately afterwards, or since the Reformation.

Upon a reference to this paper, it will be seen that in the town of Sheffield there are, *in esse* or *posse*, 35 churches; 32 of these are completed, two are in the course of building, and one is under contemplation. Of all these churches, one only, the Parish Church, traces back to the pre-Reformation period, and it has been reconstructed in the present century. All the other churches have been built in the last century or the present one. Three churches—St. Paul's, St. James', and Ecclesall—were built in the last century; and three of the schools in the same period—the schools of Attercliffe; St. John's, Park; and St. Thomas', Crookes. All the remaining churches, all the remaining day schools, the whole of the vicarages, have been provided in the present century by a system of voluntarism which we well understand. That principle of voluntarism which we practically realise to-day, is consequently shown here to be the principle of the Church in the 18th century; and if you will turn to the circumstances of Attercliffe Chapel, which was an old chapel that preceded the present church of Attercliffe, it will be found that in the provision of that chapel, the same principle of voluntarism was carried out in the 17th century as that which we see and understand in the 18th and the 19th century. What is the difference between voluntarism in these three centuries and voluntarism in Anglo-Saxon or Norman times?

If you turn to the circumstances of the Parish Church, you will find that the endowment which to-day is something like sufficient, but only of recent years has

become at all sufficient for the chief ecclesiastic of this place, is attributable to the voluntarism of an ancient donor—the gift of an ancient donor—probably a Norman Countess. The ancient glebe, and the tithes in respect of which the allotments were made on the enclosures of common, came from that source; and the ground rents, which are now the increased source of income for that church, are the investments of modern purchase moneys of ancient glebe lands, and, consequently, to a Norman or Plantagenet origin must we attribute entirely the endowments of the Sheffield Parish Church.

We then find that there is a corporate fund in our midst, which was also of an early date, that of the Sheffield Church Burgesses. The Sheffield Church Burgesses exist under a charter of Queen Mary, and in consequence of their existence under the charter of that date, some people have thought that they are in possession of lands that were Crown lands, granted by the Crown in the time of Queen Mary. But a little examination of the charter will immediately show that all that was done in Queen Mary's day was to restore, to purposes for which they were previously devoted, funds that had been the previous gifts of the charitable. The Church Burgesses, as a corporation, exist under the charter of Queen Mary, but they hold lands which before the Reformation were given for Church purposes, and all that Queen Mary did was to restore them to Church purposes. In this reference to the Church Burgesses, I should perhaps say that I am not touching at all upon their secular purposes.

We then find that whilst we have before us an historical system of voluntarism, that voluntarism has been assisted by common funds, and our attention is called to those funds of the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, to which allusion has been already made, these being, in the first instance, the first fruits and tenths which had been taken from the Church, and were then restored to the Church. But under what circumstances were they restored? When the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty were established, they were created under the authority of an Act of Parliament, and in that Act of Parliament it was clearly stated that Queen Anne's action in restoring this fund, which came from the Church originally—in devoting it to another Church purpose, to the poor clergy instead of the clergy upon whom the taxation had been originally levied—was for an example to well-disposed persons, and facilities were given for grants of land to the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty. Consequently, when we get to the first stage of the assistance of voluntarism, we find, in the last century, that voluntarism definitely recognised by the Crown and by the Houses of Parliament. Before I pass from the subject of the Queen Anne's Bounty, I should say that so satisfactory was the action of the governors, that in the first quarter of this century Parliament resolved that they would assist them, and Parliament made eleven grants of £100,000 each, between the years 1809 and 1820, to the governors; and when we discuss the question of Church property and the relation it bears to the State, I think it highly desirable to bring these figures forward, because it is proper that the facts in relation to the Church and Church property should be thoroughly understood. I venture to say that those grants, the total amount of which was one million one hundred thousand pounds, do not give the nation or the Parliament any more right over the Church property than that which the nation and Parliament hold over every trust property in this country. For we shall find that in the course of time the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty received from voluntary gifts £1,250,000. If the grant of a part of these funds entitles the nation to claim the whole of the funds, I think that will be letting in a doctrine which will make it very dangerous indeed for anybody to have anything to do with the British public.

The next question is one which comes prominently before us in the town of Sheffield. It comes before us in the cases of the churches of St. George's, St

Mary's, and St. Philip's. People can there put their hands upon three churches, which are placed in large parishes, and can say, "Those churches are built with the funds of the Million Act. Did not the funds of the Million Act come from the British Parliament?" They did; and the extent of the funds which were granted by the two Million Acts was one million and a half. Those grants were made in 1818 and 1825, and several years elapsed before the Church Commissioners, into whose hands those funds were placed, ceased from their labours. When they were called into existence, the Million Act stated that they were to have consideration in making their grants, not only to the populations of the various districts, but also to the offers that should be made of contributions in aid of the purposes of that Act. In other words, when you get to the Million Acts, the dealing in the first quarter of this century with the Church by Parliamentary grants, you have definite directions to the commissioners to educe the gifts of the charitable. And if you want an instance of that, you will find it in the case of Attercliffe Church, towards which a grant was made, but which was not built entirely with the funds of the Million Act. And we find that at the end of the period of the existence of the Church Commissioners, the expenditure over churches had been something like nine millions, instead of one million and a half which had been granted by Parliament. In other words, the Parliamentary funds had evoked much larger contributions, and the amount granted by Parliament was really not one-fifth of the total amount expended. I say one-fifth and not one-sixth advisedly, because in the course of that time there were accumulations of interest; but I know that I am within the figures in saying, that of the funds which were distributed by the Church Commissioners, Parliament did not grant one-fifth, and that more than four-fifths were contributed by the charitable.

These cases are the only exceptions from the principle of voluntaryism, and I venture to say that they are no exceptions at all: otherwise, as I said before, the British public would be a most dangerous body to deal with. I have shown, also, in running thus quickly over these facts, that we have before us various methods of dealing with Church property; that is, we have Parliamentary re-construction, Parliamentary re-consideration, and Parliamentary confirmation, I venture to say, of the right of the Church of England to her property. She possesses at the present moment 16,000 churches, and she has an income of six millions. This secures to this land the services of 19,000 parochial clergy: and it is well to remember that these various endowments were not only given to the Church corporately, but were given for the special purposes of particular places. Those who look over this list will see that endowments have come from various voluntary contributors as well as from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, to whom reference has already been made. Those contributions were made for the local purposes of the Church, and not merely for the purposes of the Church in general.

If this is looked into a little more carefully, it will be seen that there is only one endowment—the endowment of the Parish Church—in this large place which exceeds £1,000 a year. I venture to say that in any re-construction scheme, no endowments of less than that amount ought to be interfered with, having regard to the exigences of the present day; and if reference is made to the facts that are brought out in a pamphlet recently issued by the Liberation Society, on the endowments and revenues of the Church of England, compiled by Mr. Martin, it will be seen that in 1831 there were only 184 cures in England which had incomes of £1,000 and upwards. Now it may be right to go into larger incomes, and some allowance must be made for an increase since 1831; but supposing the figures to be 200 livings of £1,000 and upwards, or anything thereabouts, I venture to say that those are not too many prizes in the Church of England to be distributed among 19,000 clergy, and which are to secure for England the continuance of that

order of men who now occupy the position of clergymen of her Church. If time permitted, I should have been glad to go into the question of what the Church of England is to-day in relation to the State, in reference to the educational question. The following is the paper referred to by the speaker:—

SHEFFIELD CHURCHES AND THEIR VICARAGES AND ENDOWMENTS, AND SHEFFIELD CHURCH DAY- SCHOOLS.

1.—SHEFFIELD PARISH CHURCH.

(ST. PETER'S.)

CHURCH.—Tower, spire, and part of chancel built prior to or in the 15th century. 1802-5 nave altered and aisles built.—Holds 2,000.

VICARAGE.—Re-built 1854, with a loan from Queen Anne's Bounty, in respect of which an annual charge is now payable.

ENDOWMENT.—Ancient glebe. Allotments of common in lieu of small tithes. Ground rents purchased with modern proceeds of ancient glebe. Net total, £1,100 per annum. Sheffield glebe at the Reformation was stated to be house and croft, value per annum, 10s. About A.D. 1700, Sheffield vicarage was stated to be worth £75 or £80 per annum.

SCHOOLS.—Queen Street Schools, built 1852, by subscription and Government grant. Day scholars on books, 687. Average attendance, 465.

N.B.—The great tithes of Sheffield, in Norman or Plantagenet times, were given two-thirds to Fontenelle Abbey (transferred by Richard II. to Charter House, Coventry); one-third to Worksop Abbey (with Sheffield Parish Church).

On enclosures of common, allotments were made to the lay impropiators in lieu of tithes.

In the 17th century, the Sheffield churches were, besides the Parish Church (and Shrewsbury Hospital Chapel, since pulled down and re-built as part of hospital buildings):—

Ecclesall Chapel, built in the 13th century, annexed to Beauchief Abbey. In this chapel public worship was renewed early in 17th century.

Attercliffe Chapel, built 1630, by subscription. The Earl of Arundel gave the stone and timber.

For these were substituted Ecclesall Church and Attercliffe Church, Nos. 4 and 5.

In the 18th century were built in Sheffield—

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH	..	No. 2.
ST. JAMES' CHURCH	..	No. 3.
ECCLESALL CHURCH	..	No. 4.

Between 1702 and 1714, the increase of Sheffield population from 2,200 in 1615 to about 10,000, caused discussion on church extension.

SHEFFIELD CHURCH BURGESSES.—The Sheffield Church Burgesses are a corporation, under a charter granted by Queen Mary, holding lands originally for the ecclesiastical purposes of providing three chaplains for the Parish Church, and repairing the Parish Church, and for secular purposes.

In 1854, by a scheme in Chancery, the Church Burgesses' Fund for Ecclesiastical Purposes (then amounting to £1,600 per annum) was made applicable upon the avoidance of the Parish Church Chaplaincies (one of which still continues),

To provide stipends for two curates of the Parish Church, viz.:—

1st curate, £200 per annum. | 2nd curate, £150 per annum.

To provide stipends for Chaplain of the Sheffield Infirmary, £100 per annum, and

To provide endowments of £150 per annum for then contemplated ecclesiastical districts.

Two of these endowments have been given to the new parishes of Gilcar and

Broomhill, attached to St. Silas' Church, No. 23, and St. Mark's Church, No. 29.—An endowment of £100 per annum has been given to St. Barnabas' Church, No. 32.

In 1874, by a Charity Commissioner's order, future Church Burgesses' endowments were authorised to be of £200 per annum.

TWO CHURCHES UNDER PRIVATE ACTS OF PARLIAMENT.

2.—ST. PAUL'S.

CHURCH.—Built 1721, by subscription. Dome built 1769, by subscription. Restored 1871, by subscription.—Holds 1,400.

VICARAGE.—Built 1865, by subscription and grant from Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Site given by Sheffield Church Burgesses.

ENDOWMENT.—£68 per annum from Queen Anne's Bounty, proceeds of subscription in 1824. £84 per annum from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

SCHOOLS.—Charles Street School, built 1844, by subscription. Day scholars on books, 182. Average attendance, 117.—Cambridge Street Schools, built 1869, by subscription. Day scholars on books, 792. Average attendance, 541.

N.B.—St. Paul's Church was built under a private Act of Parliament, giving an annual charge of £48 to Joseph Downes, one of the first contributors. This charge was paid off by subscription in 1861.

3.—ST. JAMES'.

CHURCH.—Built 1789, by subscription of a pew proprietary. Restored 1876, by subscription. Subject to a rent charge for the site of £20 per annum. Holds 760.

VICARAGE.—Purchased 1869, by subscription and grant from Queen Anne's Bounty.

ENDOWMENT.—£300 per annum from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

SCHOOL.—Leasehold school, about to be taken for town improvements.

TWO CHURCHES, FORMERLY CHAPELS OF EASE.

4.—ECCLESALL CHURCH.

CHURCH.—Built, in substitution for ancient chapel, 1788, by subscription. Site given by Earl Fitzwilliam. Improved 1843, by subscription. Enlarged 1864, by subscription.—Holds 755.

VICARAGE.—Built 1831, by Rev. W. H. Vale. Site given by Earl Fitzwilliam.

ENDOWMENT.—Farm at Tickhill; rent £45 per annum. Land in Ecclesall, £26 per annum. £338 7s. 6d. Reduced Three per Cents., from Queen Anne's Bounty Augmentation. £2 13s. 2d., annual payments by Sheffield Church Burgesses. Total, £83 13s. 6d. per annum.

SCHOOLS.—Built 1834, by Rev. W. H. Vale. Site given by Earl Fitzwilliam. Enlarged 1863, by subscription. Day scholars on books, 166. Average attendance, 125.

5.—CHRIST CHURCH, ATTERCLIFFE.

CHURCH.—Built, in substitution for ancient chapel, 1826, by subscription, *aided by Million Act Fund*. Restored 1867, by subscription.—Holds 1,050.

Attercliffe Chapel was built by subscription 1630

Attercliffe Chapel was voluntarily endowed, with a rent charge .. 1636

One of the Sheffield chaplains was appointed curate of Attercliffe 1662

Galleries were twice voluntarily erected } 1740

Chapel yard was twice enlarged, from waste, with freeholders' consent } 1779

.. .. . } 1754

.. .. . } 1786

VICARAGE.—Purchased 1820, by Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty.

ENDOWMENT.—£8 16s. 8d. per annum rent charge, contributed in 1636. Farm

at Walton, Derbyshire; rent £25 per annum; purchased with Queen Anne's Bounty Augmentation money. £2,013 19s. 9d., Reduced Three per Cents., from Queen Anne's Bounty Augmentation. £2,884 16s. 5d., in Consols, proceeds of lands purchased by Queen Anne's Bounty Augmentation, and since sold. £1,840, in Consols, proceeds of field given by Mr. Henry Wilson in 1854, and recently sold. £70 per annum, from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

SCHOOLS.—Boys' School, built 1779, by subscription. Enlarged 1870, by subscription.—Girls and Infants' School, built 1824, by subscription. Day scholars on books, 419. Average attendance, 262.

THREE MILLION ACT CHURCHES.

6.—ST. GEORGE'S.

CHURCH.—Built 1825.—Holds 2,000.

VICARAGE.—Built 1876, by subscription, and grant from Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Site given by Sheffield Church Burgesses.

ENDOWMENT.—£5 per annum, from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

SCHOOLS.—Built 1844, by subscription and Government grant. Day scholars on books, 1,129. Average attendance, 721.

7.—ST. PHILIP'S.

CHURCH.—Built 1828. Site given by Mr. Philip Gell.—Holds 2,000.

VICARAGE.—Purchased 1858, by Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty.

ENDOWMENT.—£183 per annum, from Ecclesiastical Commissioners. £11 13s. 8d. per annum, from £389 14s. 4d. granted by Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty. House at Philadelphia, given by Miss Rawson.

SCHOOLS.—Built 1832, by subscription. Enlarged 18—, by subscription and Government grant. Day scholars on books, 287. Average attendance, 169.

8.—ST. MARY'S.

CHURCH.—Built 1830. Site given by Duke of Norfolk.—Holds 2,000.

VICARAGE.—Built 1864, by subscription. Site given by Mr. George Wostenholm.

ENDOWMENT.—£134 19s. 2d. per annum, from ground rents given by Mr. Henry Wilson.

SCHOOLS.—Hermitage Street Schools, built 1840, by subscription and Government grant. Day scholars on books, 896. Average attendance, 618.—Leadmill Road Schools, built 1860, by subscription and Government grant. Site given by Duke of Norfolk. Day scholars on books, 206. Average attendance, 160.

THREE TRUSTEE ACT CHURCHES.

9.—ST. JOHN'S, PARK.

CHURCH.—Built 1836, by subscription. Site given by Duke of Norfolk.—Holds 900.

VICARAGE.—Built 1855, by subscription. Site given by Duke of Norfolk.

ENDOWMENT.—£40 per annum, by subscription. £260 per annum, from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

SCHOOLS.—Built 1789, by subscription. Enlarged 1845, by subscription. Day scholars on books, 512. Average attendance, 338.—Infants' School, built 1829, by the Misses Harrison. Day scholars on books, 104. Average attendance, 72.

10.—CHRIST CHURCH, FULWOOD.

CHURCH.—Built 1838, by Miss Silcock.—Holds 300.

VICARAGE.—Built 1839. Site given by Miss Silcock.

ENDOWMENT.—£3,000, given by Miss Silcock.

SCHOOLS.—Schools near church, built 1840, by Miss Silcock. Day scholars on books, 77. Average attendance, 61.

11.—ST. THOMAS', CROOKES.

CHURCH.—Built 1840, by subscription. Enlarged 1857, by subscription.—Holds 700.

VICARAGE.—Bought 184—, by subscription.

ENDOWMENT.—£76 per annum, from ground rents, by subscription. £126 per annum, from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

SCHOOLS.—Built 1791, by subscription. Enlarged 1858, by subscription. Day scholars on books, 447. Average attendance, 277.

TEN PEEL PARISH CHURCHES.

12.—HOLY TRINITY, DARNALL.

CHURCH.—Built 1839, by subscription. Enlarged 1875, by subscription. Site given by Mr. S. Staniforth.—Holds 500.

VICARAGE.—Given by Ecclesiastical Commissioners, from Mr. Gaunt's estate. Restored 1868, by subscription.

ENDOWMENT.—£200 per annum, from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

SCHOOLS.—Built 1839, by subscription. Enlarged 1870, by subscription. Site given by Messrs. Staniforth. Day scholars on books, 421. Average attendance, 297.

13.—HOLY TRINITY, HEELEY.

CHURCH.—Built 1848, by subscription. Site given by Sheffield Church Burgesses.—Holds 450.

VICARAGE.—Built 1848, by subscription. Site given by Sheffield Church Burgesses and Messrs. Kime.

ENDOWMENT.—£300 per annum from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

SCHOOLS.—Built 1807, by subscription. Re-built 1833, by subscription. Enlarged 1868, by subscription, mainly contributed by the School Trustees. Day scholars on books, 334. Average attendance, 246.

14.—HOLY TRINITY, WICKER.

CHURCH.—Built 1848, by the Misses Harrison. Restored 1876, by subscription.—Holds 1000.

VICARAGE.—Given 1870, by Miss Harrison, aided by a grant of £450 from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

ENDOWMENT.—£150 per annum from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

SCHOOLS.—Built 1848, by subscription and Government grant. Enlarged 1855, by subscription. Day scholars on books, 810. Average attendance, 529.

15.—ST. JUDE'S, ELDON.

CHURCH.—Built 1849, by subscription. Site (except 90 yards) given by Mr. Samuel Younge.—Holds 730.

VICARAGE.—Built 1867, by subscription and grant from Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Site given by Sheffield Church Burgesses.

ENDOWMENT.—£290 per annum from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

SCHOOLS.—Built 1861, by subscription and Government grant. Day scholars on books, 384. Average attendance, 342.

16.—CHRIST CHURCH, PITSMOOR.

CHURCH.—Built 1850, by subscription.—Holds 750.

VICARAGE.—Purchased 1874, by subscription and grant from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

ENDOWMENT.—£150 per annum from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

SCHOOLS.—Built 1836, by subscription. Girls' school added in 1857. Class

rooms added by voluntary contribution. Day scholars on books, 616. Average attendance, 445.

17.—ST. THOMAS', BRIGHTSIDE.

CHURCH.—Built 1854, by subscription. Site given by Earl Fitzwilliam.—Holds 500.

VICARAGE.—Built 1855, by grant from Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Site given by Earl Fitzwilliam.

ENDOWMENT.—£300 per annum from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

SCHOOLS.—Built 1800, by subscription. Day scholars on books, 48. Average attendance, 34.

18.—ST. JUDE'S, MOORFIELDS.

CHURCH.—Built 1856, by subscription. Site given by Mr. John Gaunt.—Holds 950.

VICARAGE.—No vicarage is erected, but a grant of £1,400 has been made by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners from the funds under Mr. Gaunt's will.

ENDOWMENT.—£300 per annum from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

SCHOOLS.—Built 1861, by subscription. Day scholars on books, 199. Average attendance, 141.

19.—ST. MATTHEW'S.

CHURCH.—Built 1855, by subscription.—Holds 700.

VICARAGE.—Purchased 1867, by grant from Ecclesiastical Commissioners out of Mr. Gaunt's legacy.

ENDOWMENT.—£300 per annum from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

SCHOOLS.—Carver Street school built 1812, by subscription. Day scholars on books, 473. Average attendance, 304.

20.—ST. LUKE'S, HOLLIS CROFT.

CHURCH.—Built 1860, by subscription.—Holds 600.

VICARAGE.—Purchased 1871, by subscription and grant from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

ENDOWMENT.—£296 per annum from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

SCHOOLS.—Built 1817, by subscription. Rebuilt 1873, by subscription. Day scholars on books, 432. Average attendance, 253.

21.—SALE MEMORIAL CHURCH, DYER'S HILL.

CHURCH.—Built 1878, by subscription.—Holds 790.

ENDOWMENT.—£140 per annum from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

SCHOOLS.—Built 1858, by subscription and Government grant. Day scholars on books, 335. Average attendance, 221.

ELEVEN CHURCHES OF NEW PARISHES OR DISTRICTS
CREATED SINCE 1855.

22.—ST. STEPHEN'S.

CHURCH.—Built 1857, by Mr. Henry Wilson and a grant of £600 from Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Enlarged 1865, by Mr. Henry Wilson.—Holds 725.

VICARAGE.—Purchased 1878, by Mr. Henry Wilson. Altered by loan from Queen Anne's Bounty.

ENDOWMENT.—£276 per annum from Mr. Henry Wilson.

SCHOOLS.—Built 1860, by subscription and Government grant. Day scholars on books, 436. Average attendance, 353.

23.—ST. SILAS'.

CHURCH.—Built 1869, by Mr. Henry Wilson.—Holds 800.

VICARAGE.—Built 1876, by subscription and grant from Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Site given by Messrs. Watson.

ENDOWMENT.—£150 per annum from Sheffield Church Burgesses. £190 per annum from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

SCHOOLS.—1st school purchased 1872, by Mr. Henry Wilson. 2nd school built 1872, by subscription and Government grant. Day scholars on books, 1082. Average attendance, 649.

24.—ALL SAINTS'.

CHURCH.—Built 1869, by Sir John Brown.—Holds 1000.

VICARAGE.—Purchased 1875, by subscription and grant from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

ENDOWMENT.—£200 per annum from Ecclesiastical Commissioners. £33 6s. 8d. per annum from £1000 subscribed.

SCHOOLS.—Built 1871, by subscription and Government grant. Site given by Sir John Brown. Day scholars on books, 942. Average attendance, 667.

25.—ST. SIMON'S.

CHURCH.—Purchased 1857, and enlarged in 1865, by Sheffield Church Extension Society.—Holds 900.

VICARAGE.—No vicarage is erected, but a partial fund has been obtained from contributions and Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

ENDOWMENT.—£200 per annum from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

SCHOOLS.—Built 1865, by subscription. Day scholars on books, 253. Average attendance, 165.

26.—ST. MICHAEL AND ALL ANGELS'.

CHURCH.—Built 1867, by Sheffield Church Extension Society.—Holds 1000.

VICARAGE.—No vicarage is erected, but a partial fund has been obtained from contributions and Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

ENDOWMENT.—£200 per annum from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

SCHOOLS.—Built 1857, by subscription and Government grant. Enlarged 1873, by subscription and Government grant. Site given by Duke of Norfolk. Day scholars on books, 678. Average attendance, 516.

27.—ST. MARY'S, WALKLEY.

CHURCH.—Built 1869, by Sheffield Church Extension Society.—Holds 640.

VICARAGE.—Built 1873, by subscription and grant from Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Site given by Mr. Henry Wilson.

ENDOWMENT.—£200 per annum from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

SCHOOLS.—Built 1871, by subscription and Government grant. Day scholars on books, 493. Average attendance, 316.

28.—ST. ANDREW'S, SHARROW.

CHURCH.—Built 1869, by Sheffield Church Extension Society. Site given by Sir John Brown.—Holds 800.

VICARAGE.—Built 1871, by subscription. Site given by Mr. Henry Newbould.

ENDOWMENT.—£250 per annum from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

29.—ST. MARK'S.

CHURCH.—Built 1871, by subscription.—Holds 950.

ENDOWMENT.—£50 per annum by subscription. £150 per annum from Sheffield Church Burgesses.

30.—ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST, OWLERTON.

CHURCH.—Built 1874, by Miss Rawson's legacy and subscription. Site given by Mr. Burgoyne.—Holds 600.

VICARAGE.—A parsonage site has been given by Mr. Burgoyne, and a partial fund for a parsonage has been obtained from contributions and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

ENDOWMENT.—£200 per annum from Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

31.—ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S, CARBROOK.

CHURCH.—Iron Church given by Rev. Dr. Sale in 1871.—Holds 700.

VICARAGE.—Given 1876, by Mr. Henry Wilson.

ENDOWMENT.—£133 per annum from Ecclesiastical Commissioners. £162 per annum from ground rents given by Mr. Henry Wilson.

SCHOOLS.—Built 1870, by subscription. Enlarged 1877, by subscription. Day scholars on books, 532. Average attendance, 317.

32.—ST. BARNABAS'.

CHURCH.—Built 1876, by subscription.—Holds 780.

ENDOWMENT.—£200 per annum from Ecclesiastical Commissioners. £100 per annum from Sheffield Church Burgesses.

SCHOOLS.—Alderson Road schools, built 1872, by subscription. Site given by Mr. Henry Wilson. Day scholars on books, 268. Average attendance, 156.—Mount Pleasant schools, built 1873, by Mr. Henry Wilson. Day scholars on books, 537. Average attendance, 396.

THREE CHURCHES IN PROGRESS IN 1878.

33.—RANMOOR CHURCH.

CHURCH.—1878, being erected by Mr. Newton Mappin.—To hold 540.

SCHOOLS.—Cross Pool schools, built 1839, by subscription. Day scholars on books, 133. Average attendance, 75.

34.—ST. MATTHIAS', ECCLESALL ROAD.

CHURCH.—1878, being erected by Sheffield Church Extension Society (No. 2). Site given by Mr. Henry Wilson.—To hold 720.

ENDOWMENT.—£200 per annum promised to be secured by Mr. Henry Wilson.

SCHOOLS.—Cemetery Road schools, built 1870, by Mr. Henry Wilson. Day scholars on books, 937. Average attendance, 663.

35.—LANGSETT ROAD DISTRICT CHURCH.

CHURCH.—Site under consideration of Sheffield Church Extension Society (No. 2).

ENDOWMENT.—1877, Endowment of £2,500 Midland Debenture Stock, given by Rev. Thomas H. Howard and Mr. W. H. G. Bagshawe, to meet a grant of £50 per annum from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

N.B.—The school attendances are stated according to the averages of May, 1878, which are believed to be below the general averages.

The Rev. JOSEPH BARDSLEY.

As it is impossible in the very limited time necessarily allowed to each speaker to consider this vast subject in all its bearings, I will confine my observations to one point, viz., that the relation of the State to the property of the Church is that of a trustee, and not its owner. The opinions formed by many Nonconformists on this subject are founded on the erroneous views they entertain of the origin of our Church and her revenues.

They speak as though they believed Christianity to have been first preached in this country by Augustine, the Romish monk; and that some centuries subsequent to his times, the tithes and other endowments were bestowed by the State upon the Church as a Roman Catholic communion; and that at the Reformation these endowments were taken from the Roman Catholic church and transferred to the Reformed Church of England.

We believe this to be entirely erroneous. Passing by our real or supposed obligations to Augustine and his band of missionaries, we believe that it is capable of the clearest demonstration that Christianity was preached in this country before the close of the first century; and that in the fourth century there was a flourishing British Church. It is no doubt true that, during what Cardinal Baronius calls the iron, leaden, and dark ages, the Bishop of Rome exercised usurped authority over both Church and State. It was during this period that the Bishop of Rome persuaded not only the King of England, but other rulers of Europe, that their interests were bound up with his, and that their crowns received additional lustre when placed on their heads by the alleged successor of St. Peter. Still, even during the dark ages, there never was a time when England in Church and State did not protest against the usurped authority of the Church of Rome. In proof of this, we may refer to the Constitutions of Clarendon, A.D. 1164; the Statutes of Provisors and of Præmunire in the 14th century; and to a Statute of Edward III., which states that a petition was presented to Edward I. and his Parliament in 1307, declaring "that the Church was founded under the Bishops of the Church of England; that her benefices were endowed by the king's predecessors, and by the earls, barons, and other great men of his realm; and that presenting clergymen to these livings belonged to them by the good will and disposition of the first founder, and praying for protection against the Pope, who bestowed them on strangers."

The terms of this petition distinctly recognise the origin of the Church endowments, and shew that they were bestowed, not by the State, but by individual founders of churches. It would be easy to cite numerous authorities in support of this position. Broughton, in his "Dictionary of all Religions," in the article on revenues, has the following statement:—"Endowment appears to have had its rise from particular founders of churches, who settled lands, or glebe, upon the churches which they built; and upon that score were allowed a right of patronage, to present their own clerk, and invest him with the revenues wherewith they had endowed the church."

Selden and other great authorities inform us that the Saxon thanes in early times erected churches for their serfs, and appropriated a tithe of the produce of their estates for the support of ministers. This was the origin of parishes; and it accounts for their singular boundaries and unequal sizes, being commensurate with the form and size of the estate. It also accounts, to a great extent, for the inequalities of the incomes compared to the work of the clergy.

Soames, in his "History of the Anglo-Saxon Church," tells us that Ethelstan, one of the Anglo-Saxon Kings, granted the rank of thane, or lord, to owners of estates who built and endowed churches.

The first Liberationists I have read of sprang up in the days of the Commonwealth, when the Presbyterians, Independents, and others were in possession of Church endowments; but what little encouragement they received from the leaders of the sturdy Puritans of those days may be gathered from the following statements. Dr. John Owen:—"To take away the public maintenance provided in the good providence of God for the public dispensers of the gospel, upon pretences of present inconvenience or promise of future provision, is a contempt of the care and faithfulness of God towards his Church; and, in plain terms, downright robbery." Another Puritan divine, who lived at the same period, characterises the Liberationists

of his day in stronger language than we should think it desirable to use towards the Liberationists of our day. He says:—"Another party he hath set to endeavour the withdrawing of their maintenance: thus Julian the Apostate thought to make an end of the ministry; thus the devil would starve out his enemies that he cannot take by storm; to this purpose, how many petitions have been presented (though, blessed be God! he hath stopped our rulers' ears against them) for taking away of tithes; and that their spite was against a livelihood for the ministry is plain, for you never yet heard those petitioners petition that first another way of maintenance might be settled; yet these (innocent men?) would not destroy the ministry, no; they would only starve them; not stab them, no; only suck away their blood." These, you will understand, are not my words; but the deliberate utterances of two of the fathers and founders of Nonconformity. It may be said that circumstances alter cases, and that these words were written at the time when Presbyterians, Independents, and others were enjoying the advantages of Church property. But we will not do these men the injustice of supposing that their judgments were prejudiced by selfish considerations. That which would have been an act of robbery, performed under Satanic influence in Cromwell's day, cannot be an honourable thing in Queen Victoria's reign.

But even some of the Nonconformist advocates of disestablishment, in the early part of this century, regarded with utter detestation the proposal of some of their extreme men to take away the endowments of the Church. They declared that to do this would be an act of "spoliation"—of "downright robbery;" and would bring upon Dissent the deepest disgrace. The Independent body can boast of but few greater men than Dr. Pye-Smith, for many years the principal of the Homerton Training College, and the author of the well-known works on "The Messiah" and "The Origin of Sacrifice." In a letter to the late Professor Lee, of Cambridge, in the controversy between them on the union of Church and State, he distinctly declares that to take away the property of the Church would be such an outrageous act of downright robbery, as to bring dishonour on the country. He says: "I know, however, that there are some—and those persons of unquestionable moral excellence, and who would abhor any violation of what is strictly just—who recommend the resumption (or rather it would be the assumption, for the state could not resume what it never gave) of Church property by the Government, as a part of the desired reform. This, to my apprehension, would be downright robbery. May our country never be dishonoured by it." I beg further to invite attention to the following words of the Dissenting organ, "The Eclectic Review," in an article on "The Church and Dissenters," February, 1832. If the passage had been penned for the express purpose of condemning the Liberation Society and its advocates they could not have been more direct and emphatic:—"The manner in which the abolition of tithes by a simple Act of Parliament is sometimes spoken of, as a thing quite feasible, legal, and desirable, might have suited a French Constituent Assembly; but that British Christians—nay, ministers of the gospel—nay, individuals enjoying the benefits of endowments—should be so far misled by party zeal as to join in the unprincipled clamour against church property, raised by the advocates of uncompensated spoliation,—forgetful alike of inconsistency, the decencies of their sacred office, and the plain dictates of common honesty, this, we must avow it, has filled us with amazement and shame. The cause of Dissent is under small obligations to those who have brought down upon it this deep disgrace." In confirmation of the view expressed by Dr. Pye-Smith, that the state cannot *resume* the property of the Church of England, for the simple reason that it never gave it, I will add the testimony to the same effect of another well-known Nonconformist, Mr. Toulmin Smith, an eminent legal authority. In his pamphlet on "The True Points at Issue in the Church Question," he says:—"So

far is the State from at present supporting the Church, that every parish church in England was founded not by the State, but by individual donation in ages past; while the parson's income is entirely derived, partly from similar sources, and partly from a charge (far heavier than any Church rate) which has been attached like any rent-charge to the ownership of certain classes of property for centuries. The State supports neither the one nor the other. All that the State does is impartially to ensure the protection of the law, alike to the ancient property of the Church, and to the more recent property (acquired by similar donation and endowment) of every Dissenting chapel in the land. The latter are thus just as much state-protected as the former." I will cite one testimony more in corroboration of this view of the subject, and it shall be taken from a well-known document.

Mr. Horace Mann (a Nonconformist), in his "Census of Religious Worship in Great Britain" of 1851, after indicating the grounds for his conviction, says,—“Tithes thus appear to have had their origin in voluntary payments.” These are the deliberately expressed sentiments of Nonconformists. In support of our contention that Church endowments were the munificent gifts of individuals, I have quoted these Nonconformist authorities, in order to shew that not only eminent jurists like Lord Eldon and Baron Wilde; distinguished statesmen such as Sir Robert Peel, Sir James Graham, and the late Lord Derby; but also eminent Dissenters, against whom the charge cannot be preferred that they are swayed by prejudice or interest.

But the fact is that many of the champions of the disestablishment movement, whilst denouncing the union between Church and State as an unhallowed thing and “flatly contradictory of Christianity;” yet make it manifest that their chief design is to deprive the Church of her justly acquired property. A tract was circulated for some time by the Anti-State Church Association, in which the reader was taught to regard this question as “a taxpayer's question.” Another tract, Number 28 of this Association,—being a lecture by the Rev. J. H. Hinton, frankly avows:—“We should not wish a separation between Church and State upon any other principle than this,—that the Church thenceforward should provide for her own wants by the spontaneous liberality of her adherents. We should experience a feeling of dread, which it would be difficult to express, in the thought of so vast a revenue being at the disposal of an independent ecclesiastical corporation.” In the programme put forth last year by the Liberation Society, entitled “Practical Suggestions,” we are given plainly to understand that members of the English Church must not look for so favourable a settlement as that which was accorded to the members of the Irish Church, because “the re-endowment on a large scale—in the guise of compensation to members of the disestablished Church—would prove a source of serious and lasting evil.” There is not much danger of the Church suffering greatly from being left with large endowments, if the anticipations of Mr. E. Miall, one of the prime movers of the disestablishment agitation, be realized. In the closing remarks of a lecture on “What is the Separation of Church and State?” Mr. Miall tells us that “There remain only the church edifices to dispose of;” which he says, “with the exception of the Cathedrals, which perhaps might be kept up for other public purposes than ecclesiastical, we think they might be fairly made over in perpetuity to the inhabitants of the parish in which each may be situated—to be sold, rented, or given, as the rate-payers may determine.” It seems incredible, unless we are to take the words as irony, that in the context, Mr. Miall assures his readers, that he, and those who act with him, “are prompted, not merely to do justice, but to practise generosity.” To all such schemes of robbery and spoliation, we, in the words of Lord Eldon, one of England's greatest lawyers, “deny the right of the State to appropriate the revenues of the Church.” The state is the *trustee*, but not the *owner* of Church property. A

trustee cannot, without a breach of trust, alienate property from the purposes to which it was devoted.

Church endowments were granted by the piety of our forefathers for the maintenance and propagation of the Christian religion; and men can hardly hope that their motives will be deemed the purest, if they relieve themselves from the payment of rates and taxes by using for such purposes property which had been given to provide the people of our land with the means of religious instruction and worship. There is another line of observation suggested by the one aspect under which I have viewed our subject, on which I will, as I conclude, offer one or two remarks.

If the State be the trustee of Church property, then the State is bound to take care that all who receive the revenues of the Church, faithfully fulfil their compact. The clergy are pledged to "minister the doctrine and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and realm hath received the same."

If any question arise as to the fulfilment of these engagements, though the clergy have a perfect right to their own opinions, they cannot claim to be the final court of appeal. The decisions of the courts appointed by the State must be so far binding, as of necessity, either to compel compliance with its decisions, or withdrawal from those official positions where compliance is required. Disestablishment—and with it disendowment—may come from without, though I do not much fear it; but that it may come from within seems at present more likely. Those who believe that the present connection of Church and State is either undesirable or unscriptural, are at liberty to adopt all constitutional means of getting it modified; but we have no right to become the ministers of an established Church, to share in its privileges, and at the same time to disregard the conditions on which we were admitted to minister within its pale.

MR. GEORGE HARWOOD.

THE subject of the property, endowments, and revenues of the Church of England in relation to the State may, of course, be looked at in various ways, but I intend to confine myself to two—namely, what is proposed to be done by the opponents of the Church, and what I think should be done by its friends. Any action in either direction must be through the instrumentality of the State, and therefore must depend upon the nature of the relationship in which the State stands to this property. Before we go further, we must accordingly consider what this relationship is. Strictly speaking, the Church of England has no property at all, any more than Iceland has snakes. Each parish church, each ecclesiastical trust, is a distinct owner in itself, and stands in just the same direct relationship to the State as does any other owner of property. These parishes and trusts are not, as owners of property, incorporated together in any way; the law, indeed, so far as property is concerned, knows of no such body as the Church of England, and if disendowment simply means taking away the funds of such a body, its proceeds will not pay the printing bills of the Liberation Society. But we will, for the sake of argument, consider the property of the Church as belonging to one body, and we will, of course, gladly also acknowledge that this Church is the national Church, and that, therefore, the State stands in some relationship to this property. It is when we come to say what this relationship is that we differ. And, first, what do those who are crying out for disendowment say? However variously expressed,

all their arguments resolve themselves into one, which is this—that because the Church of England is a national Church, its property must be national property, and therefore the nation can do what it likes with it. To this we reply, that the property of the Church is not national property in the sense that the nation is the owner of it, but only in the sense that the nation is the trustee for it. Therefore the nation has no right to do what it likes with it, but is bound to administer it, as nearly as can reasonably be expected, to the purpose for which it was given. For how did the Church get this property? Was the nation ever robbed of it? No. Did the nation ever give it, either willingly, out of benevolence, or unwillingly, out of taxation? No. Whence, then, did it come? Well, it was given by private individuals, in various generations. I know it is a fashion to laugh at what are called “our pious ancestors,” though I have yet to learn how this great English nation can have come from ancestors who, generally speaking, were not pious; but we will never mind about their piety. We must protest, however, against their being supposed capable of such folly as to hand over so much of their property for the good of religion, with the understanding that those to whom they handed it would have a perfect right at any time to use it for any other purpose they liked. No; this property was given to form a fund for providing the nation with religion under the administration of the Church of England. Of this fund the State, as representing the nation, is the trustee, but is not in any sense the owner, and, therefore, the only rights which the State has over this fund are such as follow from this trusteeship. And what are these rights? Is one of them that a trustee may do what he likes with the property intrusted to him? What would become of our social security if such a principle, the only one upon which disendowment can be defended, were to be generally adopted? Why, universal conviction accepts just the contrary principle—namely, that trustees ought to be more scrupulous about trust funds than even about their own; and I ask by what code of morality it can be maintained that a nation may do as a right that which individuals can only do as a robbery? I know it may be said that merely by its supremacy the State can take this property for any other purpose. No one can deny this. The State can—for its will is the supreme law—take the property of anybody or everybody in this hall, and it would have just the same right in one case as the other—namely, the right of force. But if there is to be such a process, let it be called by its proper name, which is not disendowment, but spoliation. This matter is too serious for euphemisms; the Church is too old to want to take its pills in jam. But the moral integrity of the English people will scout such a plea, and will acknowledge that it is the duty of the State to have this money applied to the purpose for which it was given, unless sufficient reasons are offered to the contrary. I have not time to speak of many of them, but let us glance at a few. It is said that most of this property can rightly be claimed by the Church of Rome. But surely it is clear that this property was given to the Church of England of that day, and not to the Church of any foreign country. Churches, like everything else, change in some respects; but we maintain that the Church of England of this day is the natural heir, both logically and theologically, of the Church of England of that day, and that, at any rate, property left to a Church, one of whose primary conditions was that it should be national, cannot be claimed by a Church one of whose primary conditions is that it refuses to be national. It is also said that property is not a help to religion. Somebody may believe this, but nobody acts upon it. I see that large subscription lists are proudly paraded by the Liberation Society, and so with all other movements. Is religion the one good cause for which money is not a help? Are we forbidden to use for religion those means which have been given to us as useful for everything else? But, even if property be a help, we are told that the Church of England has too much of

it. Where are the proofs of this? Are they to be found in the multitudes of hard-working clergy who have to live as gentlemen and be paid as mechanics? Or are they to be found in the numerous churches of our large towns, which have been left almost alone to keep up the struggle for religion in the poor districts, from which so many chapels have removed to richer quarters? But there is no need to take special manifestations. Let any one look at the nation as a whole, and then say if the revenues of the Church are too great for the work of supplying it with the means of religion. Churchmen don't seem to think so, for they add out of their own pockets larger sums than any of the voluntary bodies give. If the Church does not do its duty, the responsibility lies with the nation, which has always had the control of it; and, at any rate, the way to make its work more is not to make its means less. The principle of a National Church cannot fairly be condemned by those who are always putting impediments in its way, instead of loyally trying to work it. Happily Dissent is impossible politically, or no nation could hold together for a generation. But we are assured that disendowment would not diminish the resources of the Church, for the deficiency would be made up of private gifts. Is it reasonable, first, to put the private gifts of past generations into one pocket, and then to expect an equal sum to be given out of the other pocket of this generation? Is it reasonable to think that one generation can make up for the accumulations of hundreds, or to ask the nation to support individually that which it has robbed collectively? The Church is now self-supporting, like a family inheriting ancestral savings; but it cannot continue so, except on a much smaller scale, if the generations are each, like bees, to be robbed of their honey. Why is not one generation to help another in religion, as in everything else? Why are we to take up a heritage of work from the past, and yet to be denied its heritage of help? We, therefore, say that there is no reason why the nation, as trustee, should make any radical change in this property. We could go further, and maintain that even if the nation were the absolute owner of this property, it could not, even by the lowest tests, put it to a better use; for a Church is cheaper than a prison; and a parson, with all his faults, is more useful, as well as more agreeable, than a policeman. If the Church is to be plundered, let her property be divided amongst the other religious bodies, rather than that it should be lost altogether to religion. There remains to notice only one other point raised by the enemies of the Church, and this leads me to what I think should be done by its friends. It is said that at various times the State has interfered with the funds of the Church. Yes; but all these interferences have been to make these funds still more useful for their original purpose, which is just the reverse of diverting them from that purpose altogether. Now, I believe that this process should be carried much further, and that the Church, whilst putting down the cry for disendowment, should herself raise that for distribution. We must remember that this property is not left to the Church to do what it likes with, any more than to the nation. Whilst it is the duty of the nation to see that it is applied to the purpose for which it is given, it is the duty of the Church to see that in this application the best use is made of it. Can any one say that the Church is doing her duty in this respect who casts his eye over the *Clergy List*, and who considers that whilst recent changes of civilisation have set the populations of England a-dancing, the incomes of the clergy have not been re-adjusted. The rule to guide us is the practical principle that means ought to be adapted to ends. Not that the levelling process need be carried too far, or that plenty of places need not be left to give clerical *otium cum dignitate*: but the rebuke must be taken away that the Church tempts the best men to go where they can do the least good, and that the Church is the only institution left in which work and pay bear no fair proportion to each other. The present system is as unreasonable as it would be in the army to give sergeants the same pay as generals of division. It

would also seem that much more practical good might be got out of the large revenues of our cathedrals; and I am likewise inclined to think that it might be advisable, even by the authority of the State if necessary, to form a systematic fund for the clergy, so that those who are incapacitated might easily retire, and that widows and orphans should be provided for. If we could relieve the clergy from some of those material anxieties which so often drag them down, we should do more to raise the spiritual influence of the Church than can be hoped from any revival of ornate ceremonies or mediæval mysticisms. I am not the person, nor is this the time or place, to go into details; but no doubt many in the Church will object to the general principle. Some will say that it is based upon worldly motives. Unhappily, nature, when it becomes clerical, does not altogether cease to be human; earthly necessities press upon clergymen as upon others, and we shall have to reckon for these until we can depend upon manna or ravens. Besides, we are in this dilemma, that unless income and work should have some relationship to each other in religion, we cannot, on moral grounds, defend the retention of this property by the Church. Others would say that these changes would interfere with the rights of property. Well, if they did, no great harm would be done. The Church has the reputation of paying, like Tennyson's "Northern Farmer," too much respect to "property," and so a step in the opposite direction would do good. A religious institution should be the last to stick at these fastidious technicalities, and the Church of England should remember that the general rights of the trust confided to her are far stronger than all these individual rights, and that her first duty is to see that this property is made to promote, as far as possible, the religious welfare of the whole nation. I would warn you that unless the Church of England makes the acquaintance of the spirit of reform she may soon have to make that of the spirit of destruction. Let her not deceive herself. Her enemies are such as neither slumber nor sleep, and this present lull is only the stepping back to get greater impetus for a heavier blow. That political party which has ruled, and may rule again, is being pressed by its most pertinacious supporters to make disestablishment its next battle-cry. And let no one harbour the fond delusion that Disestablishment may come unattended by his twin-brother Disendowment. Your enemies are too wide-awake for that; they laugh at the simplicity which can think them foolish enough to turn loose, subject only to its own control, an institution of such vast material power: they are resolved that, if the bird is left to itself, its wings must be cut; if the Church is driven from her throne, she must also quit her robes. Disestablishment and disendowment are the Castor and Pollux of Liberationism. Whether we like it or not, the political future of this country will belong to the masses of its people; and, if the Church is to hold her place in that future, she must boldly take her stand upon the democratic lines of Christianity. Those, therefore, are her truest friends who exhort her to take time by the forelock, and put her house in order. Much has already been done, but much yet remains to do: the old walls must be built up; the waste places must be repaired. This generation now holds in its hands the Church's door of destiny; it must let out the darkness of the land: it must let in the larger heart and kindlier hand. Now is the day of warning; we must defeat the coming attack by anticipating it; we must make ready and watch, for no man can tell at what hour of the night the thief may come. The Church's house will not be left unto her desolate if she knows and heeds the time of her visitation, but will be handed down, far more gloriously furnished, to generations yet unborn if we do our duty in the spirit of the motto of this Congress—"Deo adjuvante, labor proficit."

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. Canon TREVOR.

IF the major part of the Congress has not been able to resist the attractions of the fireworks in the other hall, I think we may venture to say that ours is by far the most important subject which has been submitted to the Congress, and that it has been introduced in a manner which confers great credit on the committee's selection of readers and speakers. The very learned paper of my friend Dr. Gatty has laid down the principles upon which the union of the Church with the State, and its relations with property and revenues, were founded; and the separate enquiries of the honourable member and the other speakers who followed him, in two different places, Manchester and Sheffield, terminated precisely in the principles which Dr. Gatty had showed us, from early history, was the beginning of such foundations. You will find precisely the same in all the other parishes and villages in which such enquiries may be instituted. They always appear to be private property, which has been wasted at one time and augmented at another. It has very often been plundered by some powerful neighbour, but there still remains a trust portion, which continues to be administered now for the same purposes to which the whole was given. I should rely with very much greater comfort and confidence on the conclusions to which our speakers have brought us, if I had any sort of conviction that this question was going to be determined by the principles of religion, of reason, or of law; for upon all three it has been shown that our case is complete and unassailable. But I do not believe that the disestablishment of any Church was ever brought about, or ever will be brought about, on any of these principles. I will show how the disestablishments of which we have experience were actually effected. The Church of England was disestablished at what is called the Great Rebellion. That was effected by a combination between a narrow-minded sectarian religious party and a set of ungodly lawyers. The Church of Scotland was disestablished at the Revolution: that was by a combination between worldly-minded politicians, who were in the minority, and what one of the speakers has just called the "democratic lines of Presbyterian Christianity." The Church of Ireland has been disestablished in our own time: that was a combination of the great Liberal party in quest of a policy with the Roman Catholics, who will, undoubtedly, reap the entire benefit of the Irish disestablishment. The Church of England may be disestablished whenever a political party in quest of power, and unable otherwise to obtain a majority in Parliament, allies itself with the bitter sectarian animosity which agrees in nothing else but in pulling down an institution it can never equal or surpass. Disestablishment will come to pass whenever the House of Commons falls under these united influences. That really makes the question one of very serious importance. I am apt to think that at this moment there is a very great peril of disestablishment, and what I want to enquire, in the few moments I have is,—What would be the result, or the benefit, to the State or the Church, if such a disastrous combination of circumstances should bring about this disestablishments. Suppose the State should get a very large sum of money? Well, money which States have acquired by ungodly proceedings has seldom done them much good. The State got a very large sum of money at the suppression of the monasteries, and the king gambled it away; and now it is private property. It is gone from the Church; but all the State reaps from it is, that certain private families enjoy to their private benefit, property which once had public ecclesiastical duties attached to it.

Whatever gain may again accrue to the State by the confiscation of ecclesiastical property, I think we should find it in like manner speedily disappear. I dare say the persons through whose fingers it would pass would benefit themselves and their families, but I see no probable or possible benefit to the nation. As to the Church, what do you think would be the result to Christianity and to the Church of England, of the removal of that provision which now establishes in every parish of the country, a clergyman with certain duties of a public character, and with sacred functions to sustain? I may venture to say in the first place, as regards the Church of England, the immediate effect would be that those extreme persons, who are letting off their fireworks in the other hall, would presently become at least three, and perhaps more, separate and distinct conflagrations, burning up with a vivid flame all the quiet moderate Churchmanship they could bring within their influence. Next, I believe that those Nonconformist brethren who are clamouring for our disestablishment, would suffer very greatly in the burning flames of these new elements of party zeal. I believe that ecclesiastical strife and controversy would be grievously inflamed throughout the country. It is very commonly said by Dissenters that endowment,—the possession of money and of social rank,—makes the Church intolerant, and puffs up the clergy with haughty notions unbecoming their Christian character. History gives us precisely the contrary result. You will find it generally—in experience, I have always found it so—that the clergyman or the bishop, or whatever the ecclesiastic of any rank, who is very comfortably well-off—who is particularly well-off—who has a certain dignity and station to sustain—is, commonly speaking, a very much more tolerant, indulgent, and forbearing controversialist, than the man who rushes into the fray with nothing in the world to moderate his ardour, nothing to lose and everything to get. I saw the other day in the newspapers, a letter, written by the head of a new denomination, which at the present moment, I suppose, is most particularly well disestablished and disendowed; because the letter was dated “under the hedge, by the road-side.” It proceeded from a religious leader, who had been evicted out of some farm or land where she had no right to be, and had taken up her abode by the road-side; but when I went on to read the rest, I found it contained the most intolerant, narrow, overbearing religious system that any person, Pope or Pontiff, could possibly devise. No single person under this lady is to have any right to any one scrap of property, any conscience, or any single opinion. Everything spiritual and temporal is referred to Mrs. Ann Girling, the disestablished and disendowed lady, who dates her ecclesiastical polity from “under the hedge, by the road-side.” The nearer, then, I say, you approach to the hedge and the road-side, the more narrow, the more bitter, the more dangerous to society, will your sectarian differences become; and the wider you spread over the land, the more comfortably you are in enjoyment of pastures and fields and houses, the more your clergy are educated,—which I suppose at least requires money, if nothing else does—and the more they are kept from the carking cares of the world, the more they are sustained in an atmosphere of education and civilization—the more comprehensive and charitable will be the feeling of the Church to which those clergy belong. I want especially to guard you against the notion that disestablishment or disendowment would bring about greater liberty of conscience, less bitterness of sectarian difference, or any kind of social, Christian, comfortable feelings in the world. It might happen, as in Ireland, that disestablishment would produce no immediate dissolution of society; but if it does not, it will be for this reason,—that there is in Ireland a large Church, the Church of Rome, which does sustain and keep together the bulk of the people under religious provisions of its own, without the assistance of the State. If Ireland can be saved from falling into utter anarchy, it will certainly be by the influence of the Church of Rome: but in England, if you were to disestablish and disendow the

Church, there is not that overwhelming power in the Church of England, even if it were kept together, which would prevent this country from being a prey to a vast amount of ecclesiastical strife and spiritual destitution. Now nothing so separates society, nothing so poisons family and social life, nothing so hinders the charities of human existence, as religious differences and diversities. They go deepest into the mind, and when the mind is a narrow one and broods over them, they corrupt the very springs of charity and goodwill. Disestablishment may make your country a hotbed of sectarian animosity,—for one cannot tell how many new and more bitter divisions it may generate in the name of Christianity. In doing this you will make England no longer the happy country which it has been; you will make her no longer the friend and champion of civil and religious liberty over all the world. I believe that the country will fall from her imperial position, because the character of the nation, the breadth, the warmth, and the genuineness of the national character, will be miserably, irretrievably ruined. It will have lost the basis upon which it rests—the mother from whom it learned and derived its being—the Church, the comprehensive, mild, tolerant, educated, and I trust, long-lived Church of our fathers and our God.

J. W. EASTWOOD, Esq., M.D., Dinsdale Park, Darlington.

I STAND before you not as an individual, but as a representative man,—a representative of one of the largest Church Defence institutions in the north of England—that of Darlington and South Durham. I am here as the chairman of that institution. But I stand before you also in another capacity,—as the sole churchwarden of my parish; and in that capacity I wish to speak to you more particularly this morning, though more in illustration of the general principles already adverted to than to give you any new principles for consideration. My position as that unique personage, the sole churchwarden of a parish, is a very unusual thing, and in a sense, with the rector of my parish, I am the possessor or holder of the property of the Church. This parish church of mine at Dinsdale is a very ancient one, and I can say something as to the pious ancestors who have been already mentioned on this platform. It is frequently said, “Where are the facts about these pious ancestors?” We have heard from Mr. Thomas this morning as to the contributions which have been made to the churches of Sheffield within the last two hundred years, but the references to the facts relating to pious ancestors have been very few. Let us know something about these, and let us see that these early churches and endowments were not given by the State and the Sovereigns, but by private individuals, just in the same manner as churches are given now; just as St. Stephen’s in Sheffield was given by Mr. Henry Wilson, and another church by Sir John Brown. I can parallel this by my own church. This church, a small, but beautifully-situated one on the banks of the Tees, lies in a peaceful valley, by the side of an old Manor House, which was once possessed by Siward, the great Earl of Northumberland. The descendant of this Siward lived in this Manor House, near which is my own residence. On this spot the earl wished to found a church for his people. What did he do? He gave land for the purpose of building a church, and he specially endowed it, and there the church remains at this time. A descendant of Siward endowed that church, and a descendant of Siward lives in that Manor House at this present day and enlarged the churchyard, and that family of Surtees exists now just as it did seven or eight hundred years ago. This is one of our pious ancestors. In the year 1196 the present church, my parish church, was built,—an Anglo-Norman church in the

early style. The Bishop of Durham gave power for the building of this present church. It was built on the foundation of the older church, and some beautifully-figured Saxon stones have been taken up and placed in the porch for preservation. In 1876 this church had got into such a miserable state of decay that the present Bishop of Durham issued his licence to the rector of my parish and myself to rebuild it, and, at a cost of more than £2,000 it was rebuilt, and the descendant of the original giver of the church aided largely in the restoration. What did the original donor give of this church? He gave the lands and rights of pasture for the benefit of the priest or rector. These lands or rights of pasture, I am sorry to say, are gone, we know not where. Probably in revolutionary times they disappeared, and now there only remain the tithes and some other small property. But those tithes, given seven hundred years ago, remain, and I pay £20 a year of tithes towards my parish church. In 1195, Ralph Surtees gave this living to the Bishop and Convent of Durham, now in the hands of the dean and chapter. Forty years afterwards, his grandson disputed the right of his grandfather to do this, and a court was held at Darlington in 1252, under the bishop, for this case to be argued. The will of Surtees giving this presentation was brought forward, and the grandson was so satisfied with the arrangement of the gift that he not only acknowledged the authority of the court, but he confirmed the gift, and it has remained in the hands of the dean and chapter to the present day. This never was given to any other than the Church of England, and it continued in the hands of the English Church of England, if I may use such an expression to distinguish it from the Church of Rome, to the present day. From the period of its erection to the Reformation, the continuity of the church, with its list of rectors, has been preserved up to the present day without a flaw. Some persons were for pulling the church down instead of restoring it, two years ago; but I opposed it, and it stands now, a beautiful, small parish church. Where did the money for restoring it come from? All voluntary contributions, and they all passed through my hands. The owner of the property gave the largest sums; the rector of the parish gave other large sums, and other owners of property assisted with voluntary contributions. The consequence of this step was a revival of religion in the parish by throwing the church open and making it free. The parishioners themselves knew that this church was for the parish; and what had the State to do with all this? The State had nothing to do with it. The bishop granted a faculty, and we expect the State to act only as trustee to this property, to see that we keep our £2,000 worth of property to ourselves, and that we keep our original church also to ourselves. The owner of the property, who is a clergyman—the Rev. Scott Surtees—finding the churchyard very small, had a portion of his own property immediately adjoining the churchyard added, so that he has, in the churchyard, made a gift of the same nature as was originally made seven hundred years ago. Here then we have church and churchyard given by private means; the walling-in of the churchyard was by subscription, and cost about £100. If the churchyards are attacked, and the State takes away the right of the clergyman and the parishioners and the right of the churchwarden to deal with the churchyard for the purposes of the Church of England—if the State iniquitously does this at the beck of the Liberation Society, we may tremble for our churches, and our churches will go: it is only a question of time.

The Rev. Canon HULBERT.

THE fact is perhaps not sufficiently known among my clerical brethren that a change has lately taken place in the position of some of our Church property, which I am sure will be a great comfort to those who have the care of large parishes. An Act of Parliament, to which your lordship and the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of Manchester and others have contributed, has passed through the legislature for enabling the redemption of tithes, which before was limited. This has been an immense relief in all possible ways. My parish is a large one,—the great parish of Almondbury, which is parallel to that of Huddersfield, and which contains thirteen townships. The rectorial tithes were taken away and conferred upon the College of Jesu, at Rotherham, by Archbishop Scott, in about 1475; and these tithes were held by that College until its dissolution, in the reign of Edward VI., when they were held by the Crown and so continued till the time of Philip and Mary. The only remaining endowment of the vicarage was the small tithes. The great tithes were purchased in the present generation by my predecessor, and are private property. It may be well imagined how difficult it may be to act in the face of the vigorous opposition of the Liberation Society at the present time. That opposition took the form of two actions last spring for illegal distress, by two gentlemen who had neglected to pay for five or six years. One of them was the proprietor of his own land, and had therefore purchased or inherited it subject to the payment of tithes in the small payments existing; and the other had taken his land on lease, subject to all outgoing; and they thought fit to neglect to pay. We were obliged at last to make a distress upon them; and they brought actions. After three months of agitation before the County Court, a decision was given upon all the points. There were about four and twenty technical difficulties raised; a decision was given in my favour, and in favour of my agent, on all the points, with costs. Nevertheless, as those were only taxed costs, there remained a considerable expense, to which I was liable. The matter was brought into Parliament, and an Act passed primarily for the purpose of relieving from these payments lands required for the building of churches and chapels, and for other public purposes. I would say that in the year 1850, these things were commuted—not only the tithes, which were before received partly in kind—for money payments, in the form of a rent-charge upon the different properties of the parish; but besides these tithes, Easter dues, fees, and other things were also commuted and placed in the same category. There was, therefore, constituted a state of things which rendered it necessary to employ a collector, which I do, and pay him ten per cent. for collecting, receiving probably about two-thirds of the amount. At the present moment that part of my income which is derived from the borough of Huddersfield pays 3s. 6d. in the pound, whether I receive it or not, and it is heavily taxed. That is parallel to many other large parishes in this county and Lancashire. I would say that this Act is little more than generalising what was done in the parish of Halifax last year. The third clause says that whenever land has been charged with any rent-charge not exceeding 20 shillings, the Commissioners may, if they see fit, by an order under their hands and seals, direct that such rent-charge be redeemed, for payment, within such time as the Commissioners shall direct, of a sum of money equal to 25 times the amount of such rent-charge. This is in some measure compulsory for sums under twenty shillings. The next clauses are:—“Whenever any land has been charged with a rent-charge exceeding twenty shillings, the Commissioners may, if they see fit, upon the joint application of the owner of the land and the person entitled to the rent-charge, order such rent-charge to be

redeemed for a sum not being less than twenty-five times the amount thereof, provided that the bishop of the diocese and the patron of the benefice consent to such redemption, whenever the person entitled to the rent-charge is entitled thereto in right of any benefice or cure. Whenever lands charged with rent-charge under any instrument of apportionment, or altered apportionment, shall be divided for building or other purposes into numerous plots, and it shall appear to the Commissioners that no further apportionment of the said rent-charge can conveniently be made, the Commissioners may, if they shall see fit, upon the application of the owner, or of the person for the time being entitled to the receipt of the said rent-charge, and without limitation as to the amount thereof, by an order under their hands and seal, direct that such rent-charge shall be redeemed by the payment by the owners of the lands chargeable therewith, within such time as the Commissioners shall by such order direct and appoint, of a sum of money not less than twenty-five times the amount of such rent-charge." I therefore wish to mention that by promoting these arrangements, my clerical brethren and laymen, they will find themselves in appreciably favourable circumstances. Looking at the matter independently of its pecuniary aspect, looking at it in the relations of parishioner and minister, it is a very great boon that we should have the commutation in this form. In my own case, instead of receiving in one township from 500 persons, I shall be receiving the aggregate amount from one, and in similar proportions from the rest of three thousand payments, scattered over a country ten miles long, with much dissenting population.

MR. BERNARD WAKE, of Sheffield.

UPON the subject of Church Finance I do not wish to-day to express any decided opinion. I have come here this morning to learn, and not in any degree to attempt to teach, except by the narration of simple facts, leaving those facts to evoke the right deductions. Allow me then to say, that during one week in September last the following circumstances occurred to myself:—

1. I attended a church in the High Peak of Derbyshire; a very small one—population 116—endowment £78. The church was very small but very shapely, the service very nice, the offertory followed the sermon. Passing out of the door, I saw recorded £2 5s. as the offertory of the preceding Sunday. I could not resist making enquiries of the clergyman. He told me that his offertories produced about £80 a year, and that having no poor, and small church expenses, the offertory was principally used to raise an endowment fund. "When found, make a note of it!"

2. Being attracted to another village church in Derbyshire, I was surprised to find what I may fairly call a splendid interior of a fine old church. Entering at the west door, one looked down a little cathedral; open seats of massive oak—Norman arches on one side, early English on the other—a beautifully-restored chancel—exquisite pulpit and reading-desk, &c., &c.: the rich man's house was not better than this. A village enthusiast had superintended the work of restoration, and when I asked him where the money—£6,000 or £7,000—had come from, he told me of one large gift, but added, "Sir, can man, woman, or child refuse his or her mite—penny, shilling, or pound—for such a noble work as this?" I could only answer the enquiry by expressing a hope that other people's experience might agree with what appeared to be his, namely, that nobody can refuse to support such work.

3. Still in Derbyshire, I visited another church, and found a few Saxon and Norman records and tower and spire existing, as they did hundreds of years ago.

The body of the church has just been rebuilt, and old pews with brass owners' marks have passed away, and open benches taken their place. I asked the clergyman how this restoration, which cost some £5,000, had been accomplished. I got no details, but incidentally he said, "A legal rate raised £30 or £40, and left the church always in debt; an offertory provides a balance of cash in the bank, and whatever my parish wants is freely given by my people. I ask and have."

Facts are stubborn things! How many of these facts are now to be found; and do they not prove that a voluntary offering is better than a legal rate? Enforceable rates are things of the past, and whether we are disposed to favour offertories or not, the fact remains that a parish church can only henceforth be maintained by the voluntary contributions of her people. Believing, as I do, that English hearts and purses are alike almost inexhaustible, I am happy under the thought that the Church is more strongly supported by volunteers, than by impressed men.

MR. H. BYRON REED.

Our chief difficulty is in connection with a very simple word,—the word "national." It is so difficult to make working-men, and great masses of people in public meetings, understand that although the Church of England is national, its property is not national. The word "national" must be interpreted as meaning that the property of the Church exists *for* the nation, not that it belongs *to* the nation. The Liberationist argument is that the property was given to and belongs to the nation absolutely. Our argument on the other side is this,—that the property was given for ecclesiastical purposes after the manner of the Church of England; only it was given for the nation, and that so long as it is held for the purposes for which it was given, the nation has a right to enjoy it. Another great difficulty is this: we are frequently told by speakers at Liberation Society's meetings, that the various Acts of Parliament dealing with Church property are Acts creative of that property. It is very difficult to make a man of average understanding, and without special acquaintance with this subject, understand the difference between these Acts. I have had quoted against me Acts of Parliament ranging from the very earliest times of English Parliaments down to the present date, all of them "dealing with" Church property, but never creating it. Certainly some of our Liberationist opponents have very vague notions as to what an Act of Parliament is. I was told near Oxford the other day that Ethelwulf's Charter might be credited as the product of the English House of Commons! Again, our opponents are continually instilling into the minds of the people that property held by the Church of England in the shape of old endowments was given in pre-Reformation times, and therefore belongs properly to the Church of Rome. But our opponents never follow up the logical sequence of their argument, and propose to restore the property to that Church; therefore, on that ground alone, leaving all the other arguments out of the question, their argument falls to the ground. But I believe Dr. Gatty very fully met this objection when he pointed out that the property now in the hands of the Church of England was given in Saxon times, before Romish corruption had crept in, and that much of that property was confiscated at the time of the Reformation, and is now in the hands of some of the great land-owners of the country. I cannot fail to take this opportunity of warning the friends of the Church of any concession to Liberationists on the Burials question. The entrance to the church is through the churchyard, and both having been given in the same way, they are alike sacred to purposes of the same order. And the Liberation Society knows this so well that it has over

and over again urged the point in its publications and by the speeches of its agents. The battle on the Churchyards question once gained, the thin end of the wedge is put into position, and it will only need a few more years for the whole of it to be driven home. Let us not think of surrender on the Burials question—so called. The Disendowment question must be fought out on the ground of principle, as to whether the funds belong to the Church apart from the State, or whether they belong to the nation, to be disposed of absolutely, as the nation wills. It has been said, I think unhappily, by some of our friends, that whereas the Church need not necessarily be used during the life of a parishioner, he is bound to use the churchyard at the period of death. But our friends totally forget that the dispute between the Church and the Liberation Society on this point is not one of burial, but of service. Every parishioner is entitled to burial in his parish churchyard; that we fully admit, and are perfectly prepared to grant. The whole difficulty is not as to whether a Dissenter may be buried in a parish churchyard, but whether his friends may bury him with any service they may choose—in their own way, and not in the Church's way. Our ancient churchyards, in very many cases, should be closed for medical and sanitary reasons. Then we have to take away from consideration those places which are provided with cemeteries, and where no burials grievance of any kind can be supposed to exist; and thus we bring ourselves down to a comparatively limited number of parishes where some sentimental grievance may be supposed to exist. I thought I should not be doing my duty to this assembly if I did not warn my hearers, having unhappily had considerable experience of the working of the Liberation Society, and having been obliged to go through much of its literature and platform oratory, that the so-called "Burials difficulty" is not to be met by compromises or concessions, which consist of one party giving up everything and the other party getting all its demands. Let us defend our outworks in the churchyard, and then we shall the better be able to protect the citadel itself.

The Rev. ALFRED T. LEE, D.C.L., Kensington.

In obedience to the Chairman's call, I merely wish to say a few words in regard to the Church's duty in this matter in the future. It is very plain that unless Churchmen exert themselves to place before the public the true position of the Church of England, the continual working of a Society which is spending £16,000 a year against us, will have a great and deleterious effect on the public mind. The more the public know of the facts of the case, the sounder is the position of the Church, and the less have we anything to fear from attack. The people of England, when they once become acquainted with the real facts of the case, will hold fast to the Church of England. What we have to fear is ignorance. As a people, Englishmen do not understand the Church and State question; and what I think is greatly to be deplored is, that we Churchmen do not take more specific means to bring the people to a sense of what the real position of the Church of England is. The work we have to do is not to talk about this and that point of controversy, but to spread, by every means in our power, sound information on all sides. Now of late it has been my fortune to come across many Churchmen who do not belong to our own Church, but who are at present in this country from America; and we have heard of late years the voluntary system in America greatly praised and lauded. But the voluntary system is utterly unable in that country to provide spiritual food for the wants of the whole people. The people in large districts in America are left without any spiritual provision whatever, and in one

denomination there, it is well known that two-thirds of the chapels are left without ministers. Now, if a similar state of things existed in England, we should find that in most of the country districts a similar result would probably follow disestablishment. If the Church were disendowed, as many of our opponents wish, then, as the Bishop of Lincoln puts it, "the priesthood would be pauperised, and the poor would be paganised." I have in my hand a remarkable document—an article in the *Nineteenth Century*, for this month—by the Rev. A. H. Mackonochie, of St. Alban's, Holborn, on the separation of Church and State. It contains regular suggestions as to the manner in which this should be brought about. He says that there are in the country two powers—the Christ power and the world power, and that the one is opposed to the other. The world power is the State; and, therefore, he says, it is the duty of every Christian man to free the Christ power from the control of the State, to enable it to carry on its own work. First of all he proposes to give back the tithes, and then he would have recent endowments given back, as a matter of good feeling, and every bishop and clergyman paid off: if any chose to remain, they should be allowed by a certain day to state that they wish to do so, and they should be permitted to continue, if the parishioners wished. The most extraordinary position, however, of all, is that with regard to the bishops; for Mr. Mackonochie says that it might possibly happen that none of the archbishops and bishops would choose to remain in their present positions; they should, therefore, be bound to do all that would be necessary in the way of consecrating successors, and, unless they did this, they should not be entitled to any portion of the funds granted to them. That is the means provided for the future succession of bishops. I merely wish to call attention to this, because it is a scheme lately propagated with which I think Churchmen should be well acquainted. There are many people who think that the Church of England will go on, if disendowed, in the future as she has done in the past. But it cannot be so. The disendowment of the Church of Ireland will result finally in the Church's shrivelling up. Before the Irish Church was disestablished, the clergy were 2,200; they were then scarcely sufficient for the work to be done. Under the new system, they will scarcely number 1,400, and these are totally insufficient for the wants of the people. A different class of clergy is already found in the Irish Church. They are paid now partly by the laity and partly by a central fund. If the minister cannot raise a certain sum in his parish, his income decreases; so that you will find few persons of independent minds going into the Church in the future; and, what is likely very soon to follow is, that you will have an educated laity and an uneducated clergy. When, then, we consider what the result of disestablishment in England would be, the question arises, "What is our own duty as Churchmen?" Our duty, I say, is plainly this: every person in his own locality, be he clergyman or layman, should do all in his power to spread sound information on this most important subject. The other side are organising, on a system, over the whole country. In every district they have their agents. These are hard at work, day and night, to effect their purposes; and they can only effect it if the exigencies of political parties ever require them to unite in one crusade against the English Church. If Englishmen are determined to hold their own, if they are resolved that the voice of the majority of Englishmen shall not be swamped by an alliance between the minority of Englishmen and a certain number of Irishmen and Scotchmen, the time will never come when the Church of England will be disestablished and disendowed. The enemy are active, energetic, and persevering. Churchmen, most of them, do not realise the importance of united action; and our duty, therefore, is to take action in all parts of the country, and to see that the people are thoroughly well informed. The result will be that the Church of England will hold her own, and that we shall hand down to our children's

children that greatest of all blessings which God has conferred upon this country—a National Church, with an open Bible, an apostolic Ministry, and a clergy who are giving freely to all the people the Word of Life, and who are teaching them the love and obedience of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The CHAIRMAN.

I AM not aware that there is any other speaker who desires to address the meeting. I desire to express the pleasure I have felt in being here this morning. I had taken my place in the other hall, and was prepared for listening with eager interest to the discussion which was to go forward there, and I thought the lines had fallen rather hardly upon me when I received a direction, which I considered equivalent to a command, to come to this hall and preside over this section of the Congress. But I will now frankly own that the ability and the interest which has characterised the whole of our proceedings this morning has amply compensated me for any disappointment which I might for a moment have felt at not being elsewhere.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 2nd.

The Right Hon. and Most Rev. the LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK
took the Chair at 2.30 P.M.

ECCLESIASTICAL PATRONAGE:—

(a) SIMONY; (b) EXCHANGE; (c) PARISHIONERS' VETO.

The CHAIRMAN

ANNOUNCED that Mr. Walter Stanhope, M.P., and Mr. Beresford Hope, M.P., had kindly consented to address the meeting in the absence of Mr. H. C. Raikes, M.P., and Mr. J. T. Hibbert, M.P.

PAPERS.

Rev. JOHN OAKLEY.

NO ONE needs telling that the ordinary, the historical way of approaching reform in England, is the removal of some palpable grievance or obstruction, or the application of patch upon patch to the admitted holes in the national coat. The method is often sensible and practical, no doubt, but it is liable to an obvious defect, which is often, however, its chief attraction in many eyes—it puts off the evil day. It enables a generation, or a political party, to do just as much as suits them—which is usually the *minimum* of possible change—and then to hang up the main question for solution by their successors, or by that convenient abstraction—posterity. Clearly, then, the method is inapplicable in a case in

which the main question asks urgently for solution ; and it can only then be adopted at a serious sacrifice of public spirit, if not even of mere honesty. And I submit that this is the case with the question now in hand. I should not be here if I did not believe that the mere suppression of donatives and the adoption of effectual precautions against the sale of next presentations is by no means all that is imperatively and immediately required. Let me say, then, first, that the question of Church patronage, with all that is involved in it, is simply the key—on the side of the Church's *temporalities*—of the whole question of what we call Disestablishment and Disendowment. The names of these great ghosts I shall scarcely, if at all, have occasion to mention again. But let me say at once that I have not only no fear of them, if they do come, but that it is my confident hope and belief that they will *not* come, so that nothing I say will have the slightest shade of a desire to induce disestablishment, which is abhorrent to every instinct of my mind.* On the contrary, I fully believe that some such fundamental reform as I am about to advocate will be one of the surest and most effectual protections against it. It is quite impossible then to look Church *patronage* fairly in the face without seeing behind it the far more serious and substantial form of Church *property* ; and alongside of and around that again, the immense and varied mass made up of all the many forms of *proprium*, and *meum* and *tuum*. Into these abysmal deeps I am not, of course, asking you to follow me now. But I will not disguise my belief that no attempt to tinker our shaken system of tenure and transfer will have any abiding effect, or be more than the merest palliative—very possibly adding to the disease—which does not at least keep well in view the relation of this question to the vast problem which those words represent.

Holding all property strictly as a trust, and that not only in the sense of belief in the sole supreme and righteous King, whose Providence intrusts their talents to his servants, and afterwards “takes account” of their use and abuse of them, but in the sense of a real belief in national life and unity—whether the nation be built upon the unit of race, or territory, or federation ; and holding that national unit to be the real and ultimate owner and possessor of all its own territory, and of the produce and profit thereof, which is entrusted to its several subordinate possessors and tenants, strictly as trustees, on whatever trust or condition—be it royal, be it

* It seems right to disclaim any intention in the above sentence to *prophecy*. My meaning is merely to express a belief that the *difficulty* of disestablishment mounts nearly to the point of *impossibility*. To take an instance. The Chapter of St. Paul's Cathedral still possess a manor granted to them by one of the Saxon kings—I think Ethelbert—confirmed to them by Canute the Dane—which has escaped all the changes and chances of Royal Commissions, and the like. I do not say it is impossible to disendow them of this. But I say that to interfere with this probably unrivalled title, in the absence of flagrant failure in the trust—which nobody alleges—is to shake the tenure of every owner of landed property in the kingdom. This may be no valid reason for not doing it, if other good reason for doing it is forthcoming. But it furnishes so vast a number of influential persons with good reason for disliking to see it done, that it raises a “difficulty” almost to an “impossibility,” while political power remains where it is, and is used as it is now.

religious, be it civic ; be its tenure corporate or individual, official or personal ;* and of which the ultimate owner, like its Divine Archetype, "takes account" from time to time ;—holding this, I hold that the Church, or religious society, or branch of the family of Christ, within that nation, is under the most special and strict obligation to recognise and respect its trusteeship—above all the trustees of the collective and national possessions.

And if we set this ideal over against the facts, what do we see ? There is no need, for my purpose, to strain the outline, or to heighten the colour of a single fact. But shall I not be well within the mark if I simply say that the system under which we live seems practically—I do not say theoretically—to keep out of sight this aspect of our possessions or endowments ? This may be fair matter of opinion and debate, and I cannot follow it up. But, surely, there is much to be alleged in support of the affirmative answer. I am merely now concerned to maintain that this is the exact opposite of what ought to be the effect produced, by the way in which the officers of the Christian society hold themselves towards their worldly possessions. They of all men should be the *least* anxious to add house to house, and field to field, the most ready to let it be seen that they believe and confess that "here they have no continuing city, but that they seek one to come." Is this, I ask again, the impression we English clergymen as a body produce ?

It is hardly our fault if it is not, so inveterate is the habit—rooted in the law, and dear to the lawyers no less than to the clergy—of treating it all as merely a special form of real property, with special conditions, inseparable indeed from it, but subject to the widest discretion on the part of the holder—whose liberty to discharge them as he *pleases* is far dearer to the law than his obligation to discharge them to the full extent of their spirit, or even of their letter. So that the inherited endowments we most of us now enjoy have come to be so treated by the law and so regarded by the people as to have the effect of ranging us as a body on the side of those interests which centre round real property—so as to make the Church, by her mere existence, and the form and direction of her habitual life, a witness rather on the side of the sacredness of property as the endowment of the individual, than a witness on the side of the responsibility and trusteeship of every proprietor.

If I am told that I am using language that tends to invade the safety and sanctity of that ark of the Christian religion in England, the freehold of every incumbent in his benefice and its emoluments, I cannot reply at length ; but I can only say in candour that I am not at all alarmed at such an imputation.

I. But let me, in the light of these ideas, turn rapidly to the heads of the subject, as proposed to us. 1. Simony, in its strict sense, is surely a dead sin. It is some comfort to think of any sin as capable of extinction in any of its forms. The sin of Simon

* The law by which the estates of traitors are forfeit to the Crown—*i.e.*, to the *Personæ* of the nation, is the familiar and irrefragable evidence of the universal recognition of this fact.

Magus was an offer to purchase grace. Probably paying money for ordination is now, thank God! impossible. Perhaps the nearest approach to it was last seen in the famous case (if the story be authentic) of a Bishop of Cork ordaining a man expressly to hold a Royal donative, to oblige his friend the Duke of York: and one has heard of omnious approaches to the spirit of it, in the case of the ordination of relatives, in order to bestow upon them livings; and in such cases as that of a former bishop of one of the most important sees in England, who is reported by men still living to have said openly that he accepted his tremendous office with much reluctance, only for the sake of providing for his family—which he did. I hardly like to say how easily the still surviving custom of paying fees to legal officials at ordinations, even on the very day of ordination, can be made out to bear a likeness to Simon's crime. But (waiving these more complex and less heinous forms), simony, as an act of offering or accepting a consideration of any kind for the gift of God, may be looked on, thank God! as an extinct sin. The form in which it survives and flourishes is this: it is *the sale and barter of office* in the Christian Church.

The first question which arises is, whether the clerical office has any special characters to make it a natural *exception* to the rule, by which the purchase of office, in any public sphere of duty, has now come to be universally condemned? The question is almost absurd. The special character of the Christian ministry points exactly the other way. It deals with the most sacred interests of men. Appointment to it is before all things a *trust*; and one of peculiar strictness. Everything which can make the purchase of office unseemly, unfair, dangerous to the respect of others for the holder, fatal to *his self-respect*, does so in the case of clerical office a thousand-fold. The next question is whether the special character of the clerical office is such as to bring the sale of its offices and endowments within the lines of the sin of buying and selling grace, in any sense? I am familiar, of course, with the technical distinctions between the office and its emoluments, between the estate and the duties attached to it, between actual nomination and the right to recommend to the Bishop; as well as with what are called the practical arguments—which I cannot waste time in refuting or even stating—which comes to nearly the same thing—so I will simply answer that the nature of the clerical office *is* such that you *cannot* dissociate an instinctive sense of sacrilege, in every simple and religious mind, from the act of buying and selling the right to exercise the awful charge—disguise it as you may—which we call the “cure of souls.” It may not be the exact sin of Simon Magus, but it is first cousin to it. And his name is the convenient and natural patronymic for this transgression and all its congeners.

It surely needs but little insight or foresight to be convinced that on our prompt dealing, as a body, with this thorny question depends our ability to justify the ecclesiastical endowments of our Church in the face of an always critical and sometimes indignant people. Nothing enters so largely into the discussion of what is called the “Church question,” in the minds of those classes who are the new

factor, and a factor of overwhelming influence, in English politics, as the question of our treatment of our property. Now it is some flagrant scandal which shocks them on its own demerits ; now it is the injustice which the system seems to them to work to the clergy without money but with consciences, as compared to the clergy who have plenty of money but who seem in the other respect to be less liberally endowed. In either case, I testify that nothing stirs the feelings and the conscience of the people like some story of the inequality, or the corrupt methods of the distribution, of the endowments of the Church of England. And I testify further—and I take upon me to speak in behalf of many of the parochial clergy, especially such as are face to face with the people in the great centres of population—that we cannot longer bear the brunt of the Church's battle on the present footing ; that we cannot justify the Church in the eyes of the classes to whom wealth is always an object of some suspicion, whose ideas of our endowments are always exaggerated, and often absurd, and who are the easy prey of claptrap about the successors of the fishermen of Galilee, and the carpenter of Nazareth, with the present abuses upon our shoulders, and while we are expected to apologise for the scandal of the traffic in benefices ; and that if you expect us to carry the Church's flag again across the lost or estranged districts of the country for you, you must relieve us from the dead weight of some of the well-endowed incompetence or indolence, the successful self-seeking, and the mercenary motives, which we now have to carry ; and that you must set at once about some reasonable reform, or we cannot even hope to hold for you the honourable outposts which you have already intrusted to us.

But I must distinguish between forms of patronage. The mischief common to all forms of patronage, and which needs to be minimised, if it cannot be removed equally under all the forms, is that which English law has so steadily fostered—the tendency to treat benefices as a property first, and as a trust and responsibility afterwards ; and then only, and as long as the incumbent chooses so to regard it,—but as his property always, in any and every case, with the single exception of provable immoral conduct, and, indeed, not always then. But when this common fault is admitted, it seems to me that the practical administration and bestowal of the property is, on the whole, fairly good, or, at all events, about equally good and equally bad in all its forms. I am quite unable to join in any of the cries which exalt one existing form of patronage at the expense of others ; as, for example, private patronage and Crown patronage, as against Episcopal. So far as I can venture to judge, I think that much Crown patronage is good, that much private patronage is good, that much Episcopal patronage is good. The weakest of the existing class of patrons has long been the colleges of the Universities.* The evil is probably increasing, and if the

* I need hardly say that I do not forget the splendid contributions to the roll of English parish priests which the colleges have made—nor what liberal patrons they have often proved themselves to the parishes in their patronage. But one cannot

disposition which has been manifested by these bodies to sell their patronage should grow and take large proportions, it is probable that *this* is the path by which Church patronage will come to be a foremost question of practical politics. It is inconceivable that the nation should allow these typical trustees to treat their "livings"—entrusted to them as a powerful instrument for promoting sound learning and religion—as articles of mere merchandise. Of the patronage exercised by societies I will only say that, however natural and excusable it may have been in times of unreasoning hostility to particular schools, as a protection of conscience and independence, which the system of the Church of England happened to make possible, it has come to be very nearly the reverse, and is at this moment the great means of keeping alive amongst us the spirit, I will not say only of party, but of faction and mutual proscription; besides developing a curious demoralisation of its own, the habit of truckling to trustees—which is somehow more unpleasant than the trick of toadying bishops—a vice which is at least the perversion of a natural and lawful sentiment.

I have nothing to say, then, about simony except this—that all transfer of benefices for money is tainted irremediably with its spirit, and deserves its name. It is the purchase of office in a society whose offices, before all other offices, need to be bestowed wholly on grounds of public interest and policy, and held on grounds, as far as possible, free from the suspicion of self-seeking. And our system is in large part a flat contradiction of these principles. Our system of the sale of benefices—had it been created as a whole, instead of growing, as it did, by degrees and piecemeal—could only seem to any candid observer to have been framed in cynical determination to discard the good Shepherd's own description of a faithful pastor in the 10th chapter of St. John. Set the matter for a single instant in *that* light, and there is absolutely nothing more to be said!

But it is necessary to be practical. Can we hope to extinguish all buying and selling of benefices? Of course not, out of hand. Indeed, the difficulties are so immense, and complicated with questions of the widest range, that I desire to say how easily I

say everything in a paper like this. The epithet "weakest" was carefully chosen as the least disparaging phrase in which to state what I believe to be a fact, that college patronage is the part of the present system which can be *least* depended on to produce a good result—(excepting, of course, the auction mart)—and that it is becoming less and less dependable. And if its present owners are allowed to meet a temporary difficulty (if there is really any difficulty at all, with hundreds of excellent clergymen on the college books) by selling their patronage—no matter on what pretext—they will be making merchandise of a trust, which in their hands, as the educators of the Christian youth, and of a large proportion of the clergy of England, has nearly the same special sacredness as it has in the hands of the bishops. And to do so, at the present moment, on any extended scale and organised plan—as has been freely suggested—would be to throw all the weight of an authority, which is still deservedly great, on the side of the apologists of the present abominable traffic. The undoubted benefit wrought in particular cases by Lord Westbury's Act has been more than outweighed by the general sanction which it lent—(and which is eagerly claimed by the spiritual tradesmen)—to their precious principle of *Detur ditiori!*

think our statesmen and prelates are to be excused for some slowness in touching so formidable a problem, and to offer an acknowledgment to the Bishop of Peterborough, who has earned the respect and gratitude of every Churchman by his honest and courageous attempt to grapple with the evil. But of this, more presently. But that need not hinder unofficial persons from expressing their belief that nothing will be of much eventual benefit that does not go upon sound principles, and ideas that can be justified to friend or foe. Indeed, it rather increases the need of their doing so. Accordingly, I venture to put forward, as the end to which all our efforts should be directed, *the absolute prohibition of the sale of advowsons as well as of presentations*, except only as an incident of the sale or transfer of real property.*

And this introduces at once the question of what is called patronage, or the right of nomination to the vacant pastorates of our parishes. The original and ideal authority to which this responsibility is intrusted is the *bishop*. In the abstract, it is safest in his hands. He is the *persona* of the diocese, as the licensed or beneficed presbyter is of his parish. No presbyter can go to his parish with so full and real a sense of mission as he whom his Bishop directly and *sponte suâ* sends. The bishop's interest, so to speak, in making a good appointment to a parish is theoretically, and in good instances practically, the highest that can be found. His consent and concurrence is even now necessary to every appointment (except only in the case of a few donatives, for which nobody now has anything to say). We need only protect the practical exercise of his theoretical discretion in the matter to be within reach of the chief reform we need.

Is, then, the bishop in theory the only proper patron, or nominator, to a benefice? Probably the right of the lay patron is very nearly as ancient as his own. And, with some necessary safeguards, it probably remains as justifiable and necessary as it ever was.

It represents, in the first instance, the layman's best possible title to present—the evidence of interest in the welfare of the parish supplied by the gift of land for a church, or even of the church itself. Subject to a real revision and concurrence, and if necessary a veto, on the part of the bishop, this is probably as good a claim to patronage as can be thought of. And it is one which goes far enough to supply that variety in the sources of nomination which is often claimed as an extenuating circumstance of all the worst abuses of the present system. No one wishes to be rid of it. The only way to bring it into real peril is to declare it inseparable from present abuses. Founders' rights, the rights represented by large property in a parish, the right which has come by bequest and succession, even if no

* I feel bound to say that the debate which arose upon this paper went far to convince me that this principle must be firmly upheld—even without the qualification I have here made, if that is to be used as a concession of the point at issue, and a basis for the argument—"There is no difference between sale of advowsons and of presentations; therefore keep both." Prohibit, I would at least urge, the sale of presentations, and of "advowsons in gross." Difficulties and hardships will, of course, arise. Deal with them, in their turn, *pro re natâ*.

longer attached to large landed possessions—these most probably must be conceded—some of them without hesitation or misgiving. But it is not these which are the chief sources of mischief. With the patrons who have built churches, or whose ancestors built churches, or who are landowners in the parishes to which they have the right of nomination, and who really *themselves* nominate—with these, as a body, Churchmen have on the whole little or no cause of quarrel: though there are, of course, here and there, and now and then, cases which strain any conceivable principle of right in the matter, and make it hard for the most determined apologist of their rights to know where to turn for his arguments in justification of them.

But it is the terribly large class of benefices which have become, in the course of time, detached from the landed property, or the historical claim which once gave the right of patronage to them, and which have passed into the open market as articles of merchandise. They are always changing hands, and being withdrawn from lawful circulation they disturb the natural course of promotion.

They have been as thorns in the eyes of conscientious bishops and conscientious churchmen for generations. They are bought and sold, like houses, or shops, or other businesses; they are exchanged, like so many acres of shooting, or so many miles of a trout stream; they have called into existence a form of organised traffic in the temporalities of religion, for a parallel to which the annals of mediæval and Papal corruption may be searched in vain; and they have created a class of go-between or *tout* at whose clever confusion of right and wrong, and whose shameless adoption of the language of religion, to gloss over schemes of cynical self-advancement, and of incredible self-deceit, even the soul of Pandarus would have sickened. We are indeed, gravely told sometimes that the existence of these “livings” attracts young men of the upper middle-class into the ministry, as their fathers are thus enabled to provide for them, and that they would be likely otherwise, forsooth, to swell the ranks of “Dissent.” It would be undignified to denounce such arguments, and an insult to Dissenters to make them welcome to allegiance which is mere self-interest, and loyalty which can be bought and sold. But it is this miserable plutocratic spirit which has been our bane, and which has poisoned the minds of the people against the Church more than anything else. It is we only, as a Christian society, who have afforded opportunity for a form of calculating and interested zeal of which the prophet never dreamed: “Put my son into one of the priest’s offices, that my long purse may secure him a supply of thoroughly well-buttered bread!” It is these relics of a dead past with which our quarrel really lies, and with which it seems to me at once honest and wise to declare open and irreconcilable war. “*Hodierna pugna non habet missionem!*” If any one will look at a series of articles which have been published in the *Echo* newspaper—the people’s daily paper—during the last two months, and which I learnt last week had been written by an able and earnest lay Churchman of deserved influence amongst the working class, I think he will agree with me that the ideas I am expressing are not the crotchets of a theorist or

dreamer, or the scruples of a morbid conscience, which can be safely disregarded, but that they are the voice of a spreading conviction that this dead and death-dropping branch of the system of the Church of England must be lopped off without remorse or delay, and that some who have now taken the matter up are not likely to let it rest till they see a prospect and beginning of reform. It is said, of course, that it is practically impossible to release these parishes from their thralldom in the hands of the agents and the money-making classes. I will merely say that it has not seemed so to some of the most sober-minded men, though any scheme of deliverance could probably be carried out only by the process, so familiar to the Church of England, of robbing Peter to pay Paul. It has, I believe, been calculated on high authority* that a redemption could be gradually effected, and that a charge of one per cent. on all the benefices in private patronage would suffice in eighty years to buy up all of them at their full market value. But no one, I believe, wants to buy up all of them; and it would be hard, indeed, to tax private patrons as a body for their own extinction, without their own consent. But it is clear that a less tax would redeem a smaller number—or in a shorter time. And I believe that if any well-laid scheme of redemption were launched, not only the clergy generally, but the parishioners of the doomed parishes, and even some of the owners of the tainted property, would be willing and eager to facilitate it, especially if the patronage of the enfranchised parishes could be vested in the bishop with a council. And it is a matter in which even agitation—apart from any practical issue in legislation—of itself does good, by making the traffic more difficult, and depreciating the article to be sold, and thereby reducing the inducement to invest in this form of property and the temptation to traffic in it, as well as awakening or quickening the conscience of all concerned, which is, after all, the surest path of reform. For it is characteristic of this nefarious trade, that it instinctively avoids the light, that its negotiators have found it necessary to assure their customers that “the strictest secrecy may be relied on.” For neither bishops nor parishioners like to know anything about it. Nor possibly does either purchaser or vendor love to be confronted with the real character of what he is doing. At best it admits only of being described as an excusable expedient; it must involve an evasion, a subterfuge—in a word, it can never be better than doing great admitted evil that a little good may come. At the worst, the traffic is a base huckstering over the temporal goods which were originally given to secure the independence and the ease of mind of a man alive with the noblest ambition and the highest purpose that can animate the human soul. And in this worst form the system is a conscious fraud—a paltering with conscience, a degradation of one of the noblest of ideals to one of the meanest of realities—an offence against society as well as against God.

II. Being anxious to come to a brief statement of what I believe

* The “authority” referred to is that of Mr. Aston, of Queen Anne’s Bounty office. But I can give no further authority for a statement than a letter, signed “Edward Cust,” in the *Guardian* of June 2, 1875.

to be possible reforms, I will only say of exchanges that when they are made wholly subject to the bishop's sanction, and when facilities have been given for the parishioners to have some voice in the decision of their own fate, and when every possible obstacle has been put in the way of a clergyman being able to effect an exchange merely to please himself, unknown to the people, behind the back of the bishop, and without taking more account of the spiritual welfare of the people concerned than if they were so many apples in an orchard (and no one will deny that many and many an exchange has been effected in just this way)—then I can only say that an exchange of duty, an occasional transfer of the round man into the round hole, and of the square into the square—an obvious arrangement of which, however, the Church of England, for some mysterious reason, seems to have had almost as active an abhorrence as nature has of a vacuum—then I say a loophole through which the bishop can retain some hold on the real working of his diocese—some means of correcting the mistakes of clergymen, or retrieving the unavoidable failures of other patrons, or his own,—is not only a permissible, but a necessary incident of any system which is to be worked for the good of the people as its first and foremost aim and end. Its careful regulation was successfully provided for in the Bishop of Peterborough's Bill.

III On the question of parishioners' veto, I have only to say here that the word veto is, to my thinking, far too strong. Obviously, it expresses, strictly regarded, merely the negative form of the idea of popular election—that is, the worst and most vexatious form of the worst form of ministerial nomination known. Anything like a valid veto might obviously mean, in any given case, a repeated frustration of any nomination that the nominal nominator could possibly make. And this, in times of excitement, or in low-toned constituencies, it certainly would mean, at least sometimes. We are trying to reach ultimate principles; and I cannot think we ought to consent to any invasion of the idea that it is not best for those who are to be taught to choose, or even to decline, a teacher. If it is only a question of electing a hybrid official, whose duty is to interest or even entertain his congregation—with the aid of a little music, or a little science—for so many half-hours per week, then, perhaps, it is hard that they should be saddled with one possessing few or none of the needed qualities at the bidding of somebody else! But if it is a real question of spiritual teaching, of building up, of guiding, of shepherding sheep, then it is surely obvious that the natural seat of choice for this great office is the most representative officer of the whole body—just as in a University, not the scholars, but the *tota academia* or the particular college, or, in some cases, the supreme national authority, appoints the tutors or professors. And, although this original right of choice in the bishop may, for divers good weighty reasons, be in some cases delegated or deputed, still it can never be safely delegated to the votes of a majority of those whom the teacher is to teach; and of all things, the right of veto, or absolute rejection, can never be taken away from its immemorial and natural holder—the bishop of the diocese, the chief

shepherd at once of the pastor and of his people—and given to the sheep !

But, whether any useful or operative voice can be rightly given to the people, in some shape, is another question. And it will be best answered in the course of trying to shape constructively a remedy for the abuses and a solution of the difficulties which we admit and deplore.

IV. Let me say at once that I have almost nothing to propose which has not been already proposed on far higher authority. It will probably be more of a surprise to many Churchmen than it was to myself to learn how far our natural leaders have actually gone in the way of proposing reform. I shall refer particularly to the report of a most influential committee of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, presented in 1870, and to the Bishop of Peterborough's bill, which passed the House of Lords in 1875, and has never been heard of since.

Except that neither document *affirms* the principle on which I venture to insist, that the total abolition of money payments for office in the Christian Church is the end at which we aim ; and except that neither of them points to the formation of a new authority in the bestowal of patronage, for which I am about earnestly to contend, there is, I think, nothing which I desire to advocate which has not already been anticipated in them. Let me rapidly set their provisions before you. The committee of Convocation was appointed in 1868, reported in 1870, and appears to have adopted several suggestions of a committee of the Upper House made in 1860, and its interesting report makes the following proposals:—1. It proposes to strengthen the bishop's somewhat doubtful hold over resignations by obtaining express legal recognition of his right to refuse to accept a resignation if he sees fit. 2. It proposes to regulate exchanges by making them depend absolutely on a formal licence from the bishop to exchange, to be obtained as the *first* step in every such proceeding ; and, in the absence of it, all negotiations to that end to be null and void ; but it includes a very questionable permission for a sum of money to pass, or for an annuity or interest to be paid, in the case of inequality in the value of the benefices, from the holder of the higher to the holder of the lower income. 3. In respect of Simony as regarded by the law, its proposals are more complicated. (*a.*) It proposes the absolute prohibition of the sale of presentations apart from the advowson. (*b.*) It proposes penalties, corresponding to those already in existence (on paper) to be inflicted on those found guilty of simony, to be inflicted on those found guilty of having wilfully aided in the commission of simony—a provision which would perhaps make certain agencies a little less profitable than they are at present ! (*c.*) It proposes to require a system of public register of the transfers of advowsons—similar to the land transfer registration system—and that (*d.*) no purchaser be permitted to present to the benefice he has bought within a fixed term of years, and that (*e.*) every deed of conveyance be submitted to the ordinary (before its enrolment on the register), without whose consent the

conveyance will be void in law. (f.) The committee also recommend the abolition of the disability of Roman Catholics to exercise patronage, and (g.) appeal for the surrender by the Crown of the anomalous and unmeaning right of presentation to benefices vacated by the incumbent's elevation to the episcopate. 4. In reference to the exercise of the right of patronage, the committee of Convocation recognised the parishioners' natural right to have something to say to the nomination of a pastor, who may be in some sort their master for the rest of his natural life, by a process under which every patron on presenting a priest must notify to the churchwarden, or the acting minister of any parish, his intention to nominate A or B, on which a notice, in the nature of a *Si Quis*, such as precedes every ordination, shall be read in the church for two Sundays, and affixed to the church doors, and "any person" who professes to know "any disqualification" must declare the same to the bishop in writing within fourteen days. 5. The committee also suggest the gradual abolition by law of that form of patronage which, however well-meant in its origin, now combines nearly every disadvantage, both in temporal and spiritual respects, of which public patronage is capable—that, namely, of so-called "alternate patronage"—of which the now very numerous Peel-districts are the most conspicuous examples—the patronage of which alternates between the Crown and the bishop of the diocese.

Such is an outline of the tolerably trenchant proposals of a body, not the most likely to err on the side of hardihood, or to fail in conservative feeling; and it is interesting and instructive to see the modifications, on the side both of further strictness and of qualified stringency, when this report took shape as it did in the energetic but unhappily futile action of the Bishop of Peterborough in 1874-1875.

V. His draft bill is one of the most thoroughly well-thought-out and consistent schemes of ecclesiastical reform which our generation has seen—too much so, it seems, to find its way into the Statute-book.

1. It simply abolishes donatives; the obsolete suits of *Jus Patronatus* and *Duplex Querela*; and limits the action of *Quare impedit* to cases of disputed patronage.

2. It permits a bishop to refuse institution to a priest if he have not been three years in orders, if he be over seventy years of age, or if he be physically incapable of the duties. 3. It enacts a working scheme for previous notice of an appointment to the parishioners, for its publication in and out of church, for the entry of a formal "caveat" not by "any person," but only by "three adult male parishioners"—not on the score of "any disqualification," but only by reason of "immoral conduct or physical incapacity;" for the bishop's dealings with any such "caveat," and for the eventual hearing of the matter of the complaint "by the judge"—at which point one perceives the full extent of the family likeness (by which the whole scheme is somewhat marred)—of these provisions to the machinery of another notorious measure, of which the heads of the bishops were at that moment unfortunately rather too full. But it

may be doubted whether this plan, which enables three geographical parishioners to exercise a real legal *veto*, if they can satisfy bishop, judge, and in the last resort her Majesty in Council, would be as practically valuable as a scheme by which any parishioner or parishioners could secure the hearing of objections by the bishop and a council, without attempting to enforce them at law, trusting to the weight of the objections for their effect, when known—except in the extreme cases in which they could probably even now be enforced.

4. The bill provides for a declaration from every patron (if required by the bishop) to the same effect as the declaration required of the clergy, that he has not received (as they declare that they have not given) any consideration in money or otherwise, for the right to make the nomination: thus going beyond the proposal of the committee of Convocation.

5. It regulates exchanges much in the sense of the committee of Convocation, and including the same rather dangerous provision for the payment of an equivalent in case of difference of value in the benefices exchanged. 6. It requires the registration in the Land Registry of "any deed or agreement relating to the advowson of a benefice;" but does not appear to have required the bishop's approbation of all transfers. 7. It makes the payment of interest on the purchase-money of an advowson illegal. 8. It forbids a clerk purchasing an advowson to have the next presentation of it. And 9. It enables a patron or a body of patrons owning an advowson to forbid, or concur in forbidding, by a deed lodged in the registry, the sale of a *presentation* to the benefice, apart from the advowson, "at any time thenceforward." It should be added that the measure only omits to forbid *all* sales of next presentations, because the bishop failed by a majority of one to carry that point in the select committee of the House of Lords, on whose report (which is full of interest and instruction), he felt bound to base his bill. But he avowed his wish to prohibit them absolutely, and the Archbishop moved an amendment in that sense.

All possible honour and thanks are due not only to the prelate in charge of the bill, but also to the archbishops and several of the bishops, especially the Bishop of Exeter, for the stand they made. Emphatic thanks are due to his Grace the Primate, for the speech he made in the House of Lords on June 1, 1875, in support of his proposal of a clause to forbid the sale of all next presentations, in the course of which he challenged their lordships to "tell him the distinction between a public and private patron in this matter;" and to the Archbishop who presides over this present Congress, for his vigorous support of his brother Primate and for his dismissal of the argument that if the sale of next presentations were forbidden the sale of advowsons would soon go too! But I desire to place on record the fact that it was the Lord Chancellor who declared the proposal of the Primates fatal to the bill; and though it was defeated, fatal its mere proposal seems to have been; perhaps happily, for the implied sanction in the measure to the sale of advowsons would have stopped more thorough reform for half a century. And for this we

may now, perhaps, reasonably hope. And I ask the Congress to take note of the result. The clause, which did no more than prohibit the sale of next presentations—that is, simony in its least excusable modern shape—(proposed and strongly supported by such furious revolutionists as the two Archbishops!)—was *lost* by five votes in a thin house. And half the bench of bishops was absent! I do most respectfully and loyally beg leave to represent to them that half a score of consecrations and half a hundred confirmations might most fitly have been postponed, in order to show that the bishops are on the side of removing abuses, of trying to put the working ministry of the Church of England on a reasonable and intelligible footing, and of bringing about, however indirectly, some relation between work and pay, by removing from the present system the law which permits moneyed men to pay money for some of the best paid offices, whether they have any other fitness to hold them or not;* and at least to show that they personally dislike instituting clergymen to important parishes whom they know or suspect to have a lie in their right hands.† With prohibition of the sale of next presentations not

* I know well on what delicate ground I am here treading—with no time to stop and make my footing good! I am no advocate for a ruthless redistribution and equalisation of Church revenues. But the discrepancy between work—or responsibility—and income is in many cases startling. And the bishops are nearly powerless. All that the best of them can do is neutralised by the fact that hundreds of the best benefices are the absolute property of private patrons,—who may any day put a stripling or a dummy over the heads of a diocese full of laborious and meritorious clergy—and by whom the great majority of these benefices have been bought and sold within memory, as all of them may be at any moment. No amount of good appointments by private patrons can redeem the system from this fault. It makes any attempt at promotion by merit or any other plan of promotion *on principle*,—or so as to have the parish considered first, and the parson afterwards—*absolutely hopeless*. No hard-and-fast rules, such as limiting the bishop's choice to men of his own diocese, really meet the point, for they merely weaken his primary obligation to find the best man. Meantime, the demoralisation of the people which the system has caused will take several generations to work out. Churchmen, at least in the country, have lost all sense of duty to provide for their own spiritual needs. The parish is not theirs, but some one's else. It is the parson's freehold, subject to the condition of certain "services" for their benefit. It is his "living!" Let him do the "duty!" Happily I do not write from the point of view of a man with a grievance. But it can hardly be thought unfair to point to a recent signal instance of the absurd working of the system. The vicar of an important town like Tamworth—a man of high character, ability, and influence—is driven by causes which he did not create to curtail his expenditure. And the first step which it occurs to him to take, by way of retrenching, is to divest himself of his professional position and income, and to resign that which happens to be humorously called his "living," but which is in reality the most expensive luxury in which he can perceive himself to be indulging!!

† It goes against me to let this strong expression stand. My pen has paused over it a dozen times. But I cannot help it. It is the right expression. It is not right to keep all one's hard words for the agents, who could not keep shop without customers. No one supposes that the clergy benefited by purchase, except in the rarest cases, have been consciously dishonest. But they have been content to lay the responsibility on others, or on the system, and they have yielded to special pleas, or to the persuasions of interest and affection. Nothing opens their eyes like a little plain speaking. I cannot qualify or retract what I have written. My object is simply to set forth truly the thing which is, as the best argument which I know against its continuing to be. But it seems worth while, for general circula-

only omitted, but rejected, no one can wonder if the single-minded prelate in whose charge the bill was, shrank from the responsibility of sending it to the Commons, with the risk of giving a new lease of life to the very traffic he most desired to condemn and to arrest. He *might*, perhaps, have trusted to the insertion of the rejected clause in the House of Commons. It will certainly be inserted, and probably one or two other clauses besides, in some bill or other, by that assembly some day. And we, who believe this and rejoice to do so, may, perhaps, thank the Bishop of Peterborough for his far-seeing prudence as much as for his admirable skill and temper in framing and advocating his unsuccessful bill.

VI. Heartily endorsing, then, every item of these proposals as large and direct instalments of the ultimate reform to be aimed at, I desire further to advocate, as a necessary complement of them, the formation of an elective board of patronage in every diocese—such as exists, I believe, in many colonial dioceses, as well as in Ireland—say of six, eight, or ten members, probably half laymen and half clergymen, though in a matter thus pre-eminently concerning them, I see no real reason why the laity should not predominate in number, especially as the bishop, the natural head of the clergy, and the natural guardian of their interests, so far as they have any apart from the laity in the matter, is the necessary chief of any such board. It is the natural functions of this board on which I must briefly enlarge, as it will, I believe, really be found to be the missing link of all other proposed reforms. The object to be kept in view is the quickening and enforcing of a sense of *trust* on the part of the patron. Let us begin at the points where this can at once be done. We have seen that the Convocation of Canterbury and the Bishop of Peterborough's bill proposed the notification of any appointment to the parishioners, in the form of something like

tion, to give the "Declaration against Simony, required to be made by every incumbent":—"I, A. B., do solemnly declare that I have not made by myself, nor by any other person on my behalf, any payment, contract, or promise, of any kind whatsoever, *which, to the best of my knowledge or belief, is simoniacal*," "touching or concerning the obtaining the preferment of _____; nor will I at any time hereafter perform or satisfy, in whole or in part, any such kind of payment, contract, or promise, made by any other without my knowledge or consent." And yet there is an open traffic in benefices;—actual shops where they may be bought, and are bought; public sales, where they are put up to the highest bidder; and yet every priest so buying, or having one bought for him, or otherwise directly or indirectly paying for his preferment, has to make and does make this solemn declaration! But the clause in italics protects him. Then the declaration is without any meaning at all! The clause in italics is a modern addition to the declaration made with the express object of facilitating purchase, by choking scruples under cover of the uncertainty attaching to the legal sense of "*simoniacal*." The unhappy priest is made to say—"I do not know, at least I am not sure, whether what has been done would bring me within the reach of the law, though I know perfectly well that I (or my friends) have done the very thing which this declaration was first framed to prevent; therefore I swear that neither I nor they have done it." Can any one doubt that either purchase should be prohibited, or this disingenuous declaration repealed? It is a needless snare to tender consciences if the thing is right; a still more needless salve to tough ones if the thing is wrong. Can any one wonder that layman after layman at the Congress rebuked the moral density of the clergy in this matter?

a "*Si quis*;" that is to say, the right of the parishioners to some opportunity of making their opinions and wishes heard is now pretty sure to be respected in any reform that is likely to take place. The difficulty is to give anything like legal force to their objections. And I, for one, do not wish to do so in any fixed and mechanical manner. The trouble and cost of carrying these objections—especially when limited to questions of moral character or physical infirmity—through three stages, to the bishop, the judge, and the Privy Council (as proposed in the bill) would probably deter most people from incurring it, to save themselves from an infirm or even from a questionable clergyman, to say nothing of the abuses to which this plan of putting a parish and a clergyman at the mercy of three, perhaps artificial, perhaps apocryphal, parishioners, has been found to lead in other subject-matters—or of the large measure of uncertainty which has been found to attend this triple appeal in some recent instances. And I venture to think that a plan which should secure a real opportunity for the expression of views—not limited to any points, but sure of being taken into real consideration by the responsible people—yet without any claim to be legally operative unless the bishop and his advisers think fit, would meet the case far more successfully and acceptably. This a board of patronage, and that only, would supply. I should like to require the concurrence of such a body in every act of Episcopal patronage henceforward. I repeat that I lend no accent of an echo to the popular outcry—popular, too often, in ecclesiastical quarters—against Episcopal patronage, as a whole. But it has exceptional need of safeguards—the concurrence of independent judgment. My contention is that bishops have too little "patronage," and that it is because they have no margin for the natural action of private interests that their occasional slips of taste or judgment are so conspicuous, and are so easily set in an exaggerated light. But I would never again let a bishop give away a living as if it were his own to give. He, of all men, is the first who ought to see himself as a trustee, and nothing else. He, of all men, is the last who should regard his trust as his personal property, as a duke or squire more excusably may. He therefore is the man who may most fairly be asked to share his privilege, and with it his responsibility, with a body representative of those whose spiritual and temporal interests are most directly and deeply concerned. It is the fashion to say that this or that scheme of practical reform is impossible in an established church, or that it amounts to virtual disestablishment. The merit of the present suggestion is that it needs nothing but the resolution of a single bishop to have the experiment fairly tried; and, if it works well, he will not be long without imitators. Our experience in the matter of diocesan conferences, which are fast ripening into diocesan synods, which are fast leading up to and pointing the way to a central representative and consultative body for discussing and administering the internal affairs of the Church of England—external to, but of course in concert with, and in temporal matters subordinate to, Parliament, is a case very closely in point. Equally fruitful, I believe, would be the experi-

ment of an elected diocesan board of patronage. Let a bishop announce that he will not again make an appointment to a parish without the concurrence (or even only without the privity and counsel) of such a body. Let it be elected, on some system very easily devised, by and out of his diocesan conference. It is sometimes said that these have no practical end, no effectual action open to them. Give them this responsibility of electing a board of patronage, and I do not think this complaint would often be heard again; even if the bishop could only see his way to making them a consultative body, at least at first, and could not at once pledge himself to submit his nominations to their votes. He would be plied, of course, with the suggestion that he was delegating an inalienable responsibility. Of course, if any bishop was in a position to declare that he never took counsel with any one in these matters, he would be in the best position to urge this objection. But I doubt if many could do so. And I should make bold to urge that it would be better to take counsel of responsible persons than of irresponsible. And I should venture even a step further, and submit that a bishop already delegates a still higher responsibility to a still smaller circle of counsellors, and that he is very strongly influenced by examining chaplains in the great question of conferring orders. I venture, therefore, to dismiss this objection. I am aware that a great point is often made of the superior independence and large-mindedness of an individual to that of any corporation or committee, and that this is the strong argument for the habit of some chapters of cathedrals of not voting on their patronage, but of assigning it to each in turn. The man of force and independence, it is said, thus secures his chance. Sometimes, perhaps, he does. No doubt the tendency of a committee is to choose the man of whom most smooth things can be said, and of whom nothing damaging can be said. And the catalogue of things which are damaging in the eyes of Church dignitaries, is, alas! not short. But I believe the "chances," as they are called, of independence, and even extreme opinions, would be improved, not lessened, by the existence of such an elective and really representative body as the bishop's coadjutors in the disposal of his patronage; to whom suggestions and recommendations would as certainly and as naturally find their way as protests and criticisms, if it came to be known that the bishop took counsel with this body before a vacancy was filled up. But I do not rely upon this, for it is not the point which stands first in my own mind. I observe that all these criticisms of the proposal go, apparently, upon the assumption that the real or supposed interest of the *clergyman* is the first thing to be considered. I respectfully but firmly demur to this. His "interests" are important enough, no doubt, to the parish as well as to himself. But it is the primary importance of the *people's* interest in the matter that we need to have again realised amongst us. Put this first, and other things will fall into their places. I must, however, meet the objection that the bishop is asked to surrender absolutely his own discretion. With all deference to the objectors, I do not think so. He is merely asked to produce the grounds of his discretion. And considering the weight his reasons

are always certain to carry with any conceivable elected board, I can only imagine a bishop likely to catch at an opportunity of explaining to a committee of picked men his reasons for preferring this man to that. I am reminded of the observation of a most shrewd and powerful Congregational minister. Discussing the Church of England, my friend remarked, "I envy you some things, but *not* your two churchwardens." "Why not?" I asked. "Give me twelve," was the reply. "My case must, indeed, be a bad one if I cannot convince six out of my twelve deacons of the soundness of my reasons for wishing this or that! In your case, if any difference arises, you are either the victim of a cabal or a party to one. In my case, if I am beaten, the presumption is overwhelming that I deserve it!" The parallel is obvious. I cannot doubt that in the majority of cases a bishop's reasons in favour of an appointment which he strongly wished to make would be successful, even if the candidate had the disadvantage of being a relative of his own. And in that case the relief and support of causing the appointment to be the appointment, not of himself, but of a committee, would be incalculable. Indeed, I can imagine that a bishop, in such circumstances, might even venture to submit to his council a man of pronounced opinions, or even some other exceptional qualities or modes of work such as it is perhaps hardly fair, as matters stand, to expect a bishop to countenance on his own responsibility. It must be borne in mind that our rulers have gone as far as to propose (and even to carry) in Parliament that every patron be required to notify his choice to the parishioners, and to take his chance of the result of his "*Si quis*," and of a *caveat* being lodged with the bishop. And the principle of this will probably be adhered to. Clearly, then, the lay patron is likely to be as glad as the bishop to protect himself with the concurrence of the council, when it is seen that appointments to which they are parties are not easily upset, even if they are objected to; and that if the patron has satisfied *them*, neither three men of straw, nor even the most exacting congregation, are likely to be able to find a flaw in his choice. Nor need a bishop ever fear to refuse institution to a presentee whom his council concurred with him in judging to be unfit. This would never be done by an elective body on arbitrary or personal grounds; and its objections would be pretty certainly sustained, and the laity would probably free the bishop from the cost of proceedings which public opinion would uphold. And this will soon amount to a very material modification of the right of lay patronage. The clerical purchaser, direct or indirect, will be the object of *caveat* upon *caveat* as soon as the history of his nomination is known, as it usually would be. And nothing would so spoil the market for the mercenaries and the drones as a system of reciprocal publicity and counsel between parish and patron and bishop.

And I must add this further belief. Supposing such a system to be at work, and to work well, then I believe the bishop and his council would become the nucleus and magnet, and soon virtually the repository, of all the *new patronage* of the diocese, and of much of the old. Safeguard the bishop's action with an elective and voluntary council, and I believe that patronage would be heaped

into their hands. Many patrons, as it is, take counsel constantly with the bishop. It is the recognition of an interest which ought to be and which often is above all mundane views of the matter. This would become the usual practice. Many of the modern devices of trustees and sectional organisation would disappear. Thus the bishop's patronage substantially would be very materially increased. His experience would realise, once again, the ancient paradox—
 πλεῖον ἢ μισυ παντός.

But I must bring these suggestions to a close.

VII. Holding strenuously that the prime duty of the Church in the matter is to affirm in theory and practice the trusteeship of property, and above all of property tied to so solemn and sacred a responsibility, and desiring that she should do so first and foremost in her own person, I say simply, "Let judgment begin at the house of God." Episcopal and capitial patronage has not been, and is not, blameless. Let the bishops and other highly-placed dignitaries be the first to forego, or to consent to, the qualification of rights which they might perhaps maintain, had first principles and right practices been adhered to. The prime need of the day in matters of practice in the Church of England is the re-admission of the laity to their rightful place in her councils and administrations. Let us begin with the matter which at once most nearly concerns them all, and is most clearly within their competence, and let us cease to assume that those laymen only are concerned in the matter who have inherited, or are rich enough to buy, the right of patronage.

Above all, if you dream of really reconciling the people—the small shopkeepers, the artisans, the mechanics, the soldiers and sailors, and working population of our great towns and of the agricultural villages—of reconciling them to the nominal Church of the people—you must associate them gradually in the whole organisation of the religion which you offer them, and eventually give them a real voice—as real as you give to a duke or a squire, however different the form of it—in the distribution and management of the endowments of the Church, in the application of which to their proper purpose the Christian coster-monger is as directly interested as the Christian prince; the matter being one in which the interest of either of them arises wholly and solely from the fact of his being a Christian, and in no degree from the fact of his being either prince or coster-monger. Holding these convictions, and desiring ardently to give some effect to them in the system of the Church in the employment of her endowments, or, as it is called, the distribution of her patronage, I presume to give my adhesion to all the proposals of the Convocation of Canterbury, and of the Bill* which had the support of the clear majority and of all the most influential of our fathers in God; and I appeal to them to renew their efforts to effect their high and holy purpose of reform in this particular†; and I venture to add to their

* Except so far as it endorsed and adopted the machinery of the Public Worship Regulation Act.

† I do not, of course, overlook the admirable, and, happily, successful effort of the Archbishop of York to obtain the Royal Commission on this subject, which is

proposals one for the formation—at first, of course, voluntary, but at length, as I believe, to receive recognised legal *status* and function—of an elective Board of Patronage in every diocese, believing that it would fulfil far more than its expressed intention, and would supply insensibly many defects in our system, and oil the wheels of the whole ecclesiastical machinery.

And I close with a very practical proposal. I propose, my Lord Archbishop, and I appeal to your grace and to my brethren to receive the suggestion favourably and to support it actively, the formation of a *Church League or Association for the Reform of the Law* relating to the tenure, transfer, and exercise of Church patronage.

MR. C. H. LOVELL.

AFTER devoting some time to the consideration of the various schemes on Church patronage suggested by those who are friendly to the Church of England, I have arrived at the conclusion that it is my duty to meet the subject practically, and to offer for the consideration of this Congress nothing which I do not believe to be capable of becoming law within the next five years. It is a mere waste of time to propound theories of a perfect Church government—to dwell eloquently on what might, and ought to be, the order and system of every part of the vast organisation which spreads as a network over the whole kingdom. The story of the Church of England is a very old and a very long one. We must take it up at the exact point where we find it.

Now it appears necessary, in the first instance, to consider the meaning of the words “Church Patronage.” They have rather an ugly sound, they seem to imply that there is some coveted thing which has to be given to some one; that favour rather than rule or merit is to be the deciding power, and that the recipient is rather to rejoice in the acquisition of an unexpected benefit than to be impressed with the solemnity of an added responsibility.

Do our formal proceedings bear upon the face of them any recognition of such a transaction? Far otherwise. In them the duty and responsibility are foremost, and the secret springs are practically invisible. We see the bishop—the chief pastor of the Church—solemnly instituting the ordained minister into what is most touchingly called the cure of souls, within a definite and limited area. I am thankful to say that some of our bishops actually per-

now sitting. Much may be looked for from its investigations, for, as has been said, publicity and nothing more does great good. But the utmost vigilance is called for, that the Commission be not perverted into a ratification and sanction of the existing system. The ominous striking out of the word “property” from the reference—again at the instance of the Lord Chancellor—shows that the most determined efforts will be made in the interests of property, to restrict its scope, and to keep the *status quo ante bellum*. I would humbly appeal to the prelates on the Commission to take care that the interests of religion are kept firmly in the forefront. The interests of property may be trusted to take care of themselves.

form this duty in the sight not only of God, but of the congregation. And certainly the youthful and inexperienced members of the flock might be led to think that what so venerable a man does with so much solemnity, is an act upon which he has exercised his best judgment; and their tender minds would be somewhat rudely shocked by being told that, in the majority of cases, he is acting under restraint of law, and dare not refuse to execute his sacred duties, even when his own mind and will are opposed to the desirability of the transaction.

We are, therefore, compelled to define Church patronage as the right to present to the bishop a clerk whom the bishop cannot refuse to institute, into not only the cure of souls, but the possession for life of all the temporalities of the benefice, comprising, most probably, a pleasant and convenient residence, and an income the security of which cannot be exceeded by any other mode of investment.

Now, in the face of this definition, I venture to ask whether it is wonderful that men should covet to possess this right of presentation in order to use it as a means of patronising their relatives and friends—in other words, that those who have money in the public funds, yielding them three per cent. interest, should choose to invest it in the purchase of a highly respectable position for their friend (for whose use and benefit they had already destined the money), while all the while the money pays a larger rate of interest than if left in its original investment?

Now the annual value of the benefices in the Church of England is nearly £4,000,000, and therefore our attention is invited to a subject of great magnitude, which must be approached with the utmost caution, and as to which legislation in the way of reform is most difficult and embarrassing.

Who, then, are the favoured individuals to whom the law has entrusted the distribution of this immense patronage? Singularly enough the reply is, that it is almost equally divided between public and private patrons.

Who are the public patrons?

Bishops and officers of State,
 Chapters,
 Colleges.

And who are the private patrons?

Bodies of Trustees,
 Private individuals.

And how is the patronage acquired?

By Office,
 By prescription and usage,
 By purchase.

The question is—Can any alteration be made in this system, or in any parts of it, by which the good of the Church, *i.e.* of the whole body of the Church, lay as well as clerical, can be promoted?

Some encouragement may be derived from the admitted fact that such reforms as the abolition of pluralities, non-residence, simony, and such like, have worked extremely well, and that the Church is

all the stronger in itself, and in the affections of the people, by the adoption of these measures. Let us never forget that even these scanty reforms had their opponents, and were interferences with an absolute and maintained right of property which, however, can never justly be claimed for the owners of benefices in a public institution.

In regard to those livings which are in the gift of public persons, there is really no prospect whatever of any alteration. I suggest none. What is desired is, that the public conscience should arouse all such patrons to the deep and honest conviction that they have a public duty to discharge, and are solemnly bound to discharge it impartially for the public good.

This brings us to the enormous amount of patronage which belongs to private individuals—which they hold free from any obligations, except such as are imposed by law, and which they distribute according to their own absolute will and pleasure. Few people contend that such patronage is an unmixed evil—many consider that it is far more good than evil. But it cannot be doubted that it is amongst this class of patronage that what are considered great and crying evils develop themselves. It is, therefore, mainly in regard to these that alterations are possible, and may now be discussed.

The three divisions which I am to discuss are—Simony, Exchange, and Parishioners' Veto; but before touching upon each separately, I wish to say that, in my opinion, the necessity for dealing with any of them would be very much affected by such a reasonable addition to the powers of the bishop as would elevate him to something more than a mere ministerial officer. It is very unfair to throw on bishops responsibility without power; to hold them responsible for all the grievances in the Church, and yet tie their hands so that they can do nothing to redress them.

On this ground, therefore, I suggest that all holders of ecclesiastical patronage should have their rights limited by enactments enabling the bishop to refuse to institute, if he should think proper, in defined cases:—

Any clerk whose voice or other physical infirmities render him unfit, in the opinion of the bishop, to discharge his duties effectively.

Any clerk over 65 years of age, or under ten years in priest's orders, appointed to a living with a population of 15,000, or with Church patronage attached.

And so, according to a variable scale as to age or inexperience, to be regulated with regard to the population or other defined responsibilities of the position.

It would also be well for the bishop to have the absolute power of issuing a commission to five beneficed clergymen, or other dignitaries of the Church, to inquire into the fitness of any nominee on general or special grounds, always bearing in mind that the edification of the people is the main end to be attained.

All these forms might, with perfect safety, be left in the hands of the bishop, as far greater powers are entrusted to the Secretary of State. The occasions would be very few upon which he would be called on to exercise them; for the mere fact of his possessing the powers would exert a most salutary influence on patrons, and on clergymen also desiring promotion, who would take care to avoid giving an opportunity for the administration of so severe a rebuff as might thus be incurred.

It will also be observed that the bishop would not be under any obligation to refuse institution on the ground of age, if he were satisfied that the competency of the nominee was in all respects sufficient.

Such powers as these would take away all possibility of such scandals being perpetuated as were brought before the Committee of the House of Lords in 1874.

Let us now turn to the delicate subject of *Simony*. The word is extremely objectionable. It has never been defined with the exactness which is absolutely essential in regard to such an offence; and it has therefore been held to mean anything or nothing, according to the opinion of the supposed offender, misled and perverted (as it too often is) by specious reasoning of interested and paid advisers. It is distressing to read the opinions given by the ablest and most experienced professional men in the kingdom as to the extent to which the clerical mind is deluded on this subject. No one will suspect Mr. Robert Few of any feelings inimical to the clergy. He was asked by the Committee of the Lords:—Practically you have had considerable difficulty in getting clergymen to understand the stringent character of the late oath against Simony, have you not? And he replied:—"Undoubtedly, even in the case of men of undoubted piety; it is quite remarkable how dense they were in seeing what its tenor was; and I remember my father constantly dwelling on the same point, that he had to read it over to them. These were men of undoubted piety, and yet they could not see that what they desired to do was against the oath. Hence one's objections to the oath. It is bad for the over-scrupulous, to whom it is a snare; and the unscrupulous man swallows it wholesale." The enquiry goes on to shew that matters are not mended by the present declaration, but rather made worse, as men attach less solemnity to a declaration than an oath,—which is marvellous in educated men, seeing that the legal consequences are identical.

In such a state of circumstances, it appears pretty clear that the right thing to do is to devise some means by which both oath and declaration may be abolished.

The whole question of Simony depends upon the legality of traffic for money in the right of presentation to a living, whether that right is limited to one turn, or whether it means the permanent and perpetual right of presentation.

Much of the restrictive legislation of this country has been abolished, and almost invariably with good results. Within my own memory it was illegal to receive more than 5 per cent. interest; but as many borrowers were willing to pay more, all kinds of devices were

resorted to in order to evade the law. Eventually all restrictions were abolished. And what has been the result? I verily believe that the spendthrift has been made to know more clearly how foolish and exorbitant his bargains are; while the current rate of interest has been diminished rather than enhanced; and certainly the rate of interest has been lower since the abolition of the Usury Laws than ever it was before.

The principle to be observed therefore is, that whatever is allowed in ecclesiastical matters must be plain, open, and free from all possibility of secrecy or delusion. It would be better to allow vacant next presentations to be offered for public competition than to permit the present state of uncertainty and deception to be persevered in.

It is considered that a benefice is property in the ordinary sense of the term—that it can be bought, sold, devised, settled, vested in trustees, and mortgaged at the absolute will of the owner, in the same way as any other part of his estate.

The owner of the benefice is, as a matter of course, the owner of the right to present at the next avoidance of the living. This is commonly called the next presentation. Ought he to have power to separate this right of presentation for the next, or any number of times, from the benefice itself? It may be at once replied—Why not? A freeholder may grant a lease of his estate, which confers upon the lessor powers and privileges quite as large, comparatively, as the right of presentation; and why should not the owner of the benefice carve out a portion of his right and sell it to the best bidder? And again, why should the fact of vacancy, or the near prospect of vacancy, which greatly enhances the value of his property, be made the ground of restricting his rights? The answer to this question involves the whole case before us. Nearly all the witnesses examined before the Committee, when driven into a corner on the matter, were compelled to admit that the only reply which could be given logically was that public opinion would regard such transactions as the grossest scandals; and inasmuch as there is a thin film of illegality cast over them at this time (like a spider's web to catch the unwary) it is not to be thought of that a free and open market should be established in the cure of souls. No prudent man can doubt the immense force of this plain and palpable argument; while there is much reason to believe that the growing intelligence of our people enables them to see that, as a plain matter of unvarnished fact, their present position is very little better.

Hence I arrive at the conclusion that one or other alternation must of adopted: either abolish every possible restriction on the sale of next presentations; or, abolish the sale of them altogether.

I anticipate the astute and ingenious objections of those who can give many reasons for contending that dealings in benefices may be made as objectionable as those in next presentations.

There is no sufficient reply to such objections. So long as benefices are recognised as property, it is merely childish to attempt to speak of dealings in them as involving some moral incongruity. Admit that the incumbent may be aged. Admit that he may be induced to resign by a pecuniary consideration. Admit that the

purchaser of the benefice may afterwards assign it at a previously agreed price to the original owner or his nominee. None of these contingencies appear to me to have any weight against the value of removing the temptations to making false declarations, which now operate to demoralize the clergy and offend the people. Illegality is a very expensive thing. It maintains a nest of harpies who live by the technicalities it engenders ; and any amount of clear and open objections is preferable to one secret and silent, but widely-spread conviction in the public mind, that the morals of the clergy in such matters as oaths, are rather less stringent than those of the general community.

Still, whatever safeguards can be devised, should certainly be used ; and they must be well considered by experienced men. I suggest—

The abolition of donatives, as a most improper restriction on the bishops' power to refuse to receive the resignation of a clergyman.

The maintenance of registers in every diocese, in which any transaction in benefices should be recorded within a month of its completion.

The absolute avoidance of all contracts, of whatever description, not so registered.

The unlimited power of bishops to refuse to institute, without assigning a cause, any clergyman presented to a living by a party who had been the registered owner of the benefice for less than twelve months, and a lapse to the Crown of the right to present, unless a suitable nominee were presented within six months from avoidance.

The effect of carrying out these suggestions would be to abolish the offence of Simony altogether, by placing the traffic in benefices on legal and defined conditions, and should be accompanied by the abolition of all the declarations now required from the clergy on matters of a purely pecuniary character.

Exchanges are next to be considered.

There are many reasons why these should rather be encouraged than discouraged, and therefore difficulties should be removed rather than new ones imposed.

The abolition of donatives would give the bishop an effective right to refuse to accept a resignation ; and if the consent of the patrons of each living and the bishops of each diocese were required (as is really the case) one can hardly conceive any real difficulty arising, except in cases where livings are sequestered. It has always appeared to me that the whole doctrine of sequestration requires to be re-considered, in the light in which the public departments of the State deal with civil servants. It has now been recognised that the creditor is as much to blame for giving credit as the debtor is for taking it, and that no consideration is due to the creditor which could in the slightest degree impair the full efficiency

of the debtor to discharge the duties for which his emolument is granted.

There remains the question: Is money to be paid for equality of exchange? So far as the patrons are concerned, there can be no objection; and even as to the incumbents, if the transaction is recorded in the registry, there seems no reason why a man who is compelled to relinquish a part of his income should not be paid for so doing. At all events it is better to do so than for him to remain in the inefficient discharge of his duties, or to effect some secret bargain in which he will be sure to obtain less than his right. It is hard to see that the parishioners could have any reason to complain of such a transaction.

We now come to a very different question, viz.:—*Parishioners' Veto*.

Here also we must use great plainness of speech, and not affect a liberality which we do not intend to practise. We may certainly rely that the public mind is quite acute enough to estimate at its true value any concession which may be proposed. At present the parishioners have no voice whatever in the selection of their pastor, and therefore may be expected to receive gratefully any real improvement.

It is well known what a veto means. The possession of it is almost tantamount to being owner of the advowson; and we must therefore at once assert that it is not proposed to confer such power on the parishioners. The use of the word veto is likely to occasion misunderstanding; and it is well at once to clear this away by avowing that no such suggestion will be made.

Is it then possible to confer on parishioners any real power? The giving of a month's notice of an intended nomination is worse than useless, unless it is followed by the power to initiate some effective action.

The only method which appears practicable is to allow the parishioners to issue, as of right, but at the peril of costs, a commission to five men in the county, who hold office by election, to enquire as to the fitness of a proposed nominee.

Let something be done on the three important questions we have been discussing, which will remove just grounds of complaint, and additional security will be given to the Church, which is the main bulwark of the faith in this land.

ADDRESSES.

Mr. W. SPENCER-STANHOPE, M.P.

I WAS about to condole with you upon the loss of the speeches which were to be expected from the announcement on the paper. You have lost two well prepared speeches from men who have given this subject their study. The Lord Archbishop has certainly been able to supply two Members of Parliament in their place; but in so far as I am concerned I am obeying his order in saying a few words without any sort of preparation. With respect to the hon. member who is to take the other

part, he is a man who has made all Church matters his special study, and no doubt you will have a good speech from him. This question is one of very great difficulty, and the point I wish to urge upon the Congress is,—that although the evils of the present system are many and are patent, still in this, as in other matters which affect the institutions of the country, it is well not to act with any haste, or to advocate any hard and fast line or any cut and dried system, unless one is very sure that the substitute for the existing evil is better and will work better than the one which exists. There is much similarity between the way in which the incumbents and the clergy are appointed, and the way in which we are elected as members of the House of Commons. There are a great variety of ways by which the House of Commons may be reached as well as the Church; and I believe that if one single means only were substituted—however logical, and however it might be defended on abstract principles—we should miss that variety by which it now happens that every possible interest finds an able exponent in that House, in the person of some member who thoroughly understands and is interested in that particular subject. Now the sources from which these appointments of clergy are made have been stated to you in the papers which have been read, and are public and private and Crown patronage. No doubt it is desirable that the bishops should have a very large share of the patronage. It is doubtful whether their share is sufficient in all cases, particularly if we increase the number of the bishoprics, for then the difficulty arises of supplying them with a corresponding amount of patronage. The object of that is clear—that they may be able to exercise a supervision, both over the young men who are entering the ministry, and over those who, from different circumstances, require a change or relaxation of their duties, and that they may be able to promote those who are rising young men, and to reward those who have done their duty well, by the presentation to them of suitable livings. The point which has been chiefly attacked is that of private patronage. That system has grown up in the way in which the Church of England itself has grown up. Churches have been provided by the owners of property, and the endowments have been provided in a similar manner by the owners of property; and as a return for these provisions in old and modern days they have exercised the right of presentation, and of choosing the clergyman for that living which they have instituted at their own cost, and for which they have provided a church. It seems reasonable that that should be so; and I think if we look round the country and see what kind of clergy are generally presented to livings in private patronage they will bear favourable comparison, as far as their efficiency is concerned, with those of public patronage. But I do not wish to say that this is perfectly satisfactory as it stands, and that it is not capable of improvement. A suggestion was made with that object in the last paper read: it was that of giving the bishops more power of veto over such presentations: and it is well worthy of consideration. But on the other hand, if we wish to do away with this, what is the natural suggestion which may be most probably made as a means of our supplying its place? I think it would be very difficult to oppose the cry which would arise for public election among the parishioners, if private patronage were done away with. There will be a movement for a public election of the minister. There is something to be said for it; but I believe that in practice nothing would work worse. Where you have a minister elected, something in the same way as a Member of Parliament is, by his constituents, you would have the parish divided into two parties, one half of which would feel that their minister owed them an obligation for having been supported by them in his election, and the other half would be more or less opposed to him because they had voted for some other man; and I think the practical result of that would be a lasting discord and division in the parish. To turn to the next point of the subject—that of the sale of livings—that, no doubt, is a question which should occupy

a great deal of the attention of Churchmen. As far as my limited observation goes, I should wish to say that I think the sale of the next presentation is in almost all cases bad. I do not see that any harm could be done by entirely doing away with the sale of next presentations. The sale of advowsons stands on a different footing; because if I am right in saying that the private patronage of the living depends in a considerable degree upon the property by which that Church work has been provided, the presentation to that living is, to a considerable extent, a part and parcel of that property. And if the owner of that property parts with it, it is natural that the person who purchases that property, if he wishes for the welfare of the parish in which he is going to live, would like to have some of the privileges that his predecessor had in appointing a clergyman to the church. And I do not see in such a case any very valid objection to his purchasing the advowson along with the property he purchases. And the Legislature has, to some extent, taken that view of the case lately. You are all aware that not very long ago an Act was passed which rendered the purchase of the advowson of certain livings, which were the gift of the Crown, legal. In fact the arrangement was something of this kind, in the case of the small livings, which were in the gift of the Lord Chancellor. If any person who wished to purchase the advowson of one of these livings would increase the living, the purchase might be made legal, and the money due to the Crown for the purchase of the advowson of that living being added to the sum raised in the locality so as to improve its value, then the purchaser became the patron of the living. That has been approved by Parliament, and that is a recent Act which must receive some consideration before it can be said that the sale of livings of every kind is bad, and ought to be done away with. I think that this is one of these very difficult questions which should be kept calmly before the minds of Churchmen; and if some organisation or some permanent committee could be formed which should have the power to consult and advise as to the best modes of improving that which was bad in the present system, it would be well; because we must remember this,—that in the purchase and exchanges of livings there is, at the present moment, certain underhand proceedings which the law of simony, as it were, causes; and this has given rise to a traffic in the next presentation to livings and in exchanges which is of the worst possible description. I should not like to make public, without sufficient proof, things which have come to my knowledge; but there are ways in which these exchanges are managed, which I hope will attract the attention of the heads of the Church, in order that a stop may be put to it; because these things are done as a sort of matter of business, and there are persons who make it their trade to carry on this work with the object of robbing the Church. I hope, therefore, that this question will be carefully considered; but at the same time we must take care that we do not advocate any hard and fast line which would do away with the variety of means which now exist of entering into the Church.

REV. F. F. GOË.

I CONFESS that it was with some reluctance that I agreed to trouble the meeting with any observations on this subject, because I think it is a subject more suitable to be discussed by the laity than by the clergy. For a clergyman it is a disagreeable, delicate and difficult topic of discussion. It is disagreeable, because we know that whenever the subject is made prominent, our opponents lay hold of this grievous blot; it is exhibited to the reprobation of the Church's enemies, and is

made the occasion of saying hard and unkind things of her. It is delicate, because, as other speakers have remarked, men do not always see clearly that a particular transaction is simoniacal; and if sweeping assertions are made, they may wound the consciences of some who, as patrons or presenters, have performed acts which they did not perceive to be simoniacal. And it is difficult, because in discussing this subject we are speaking of the Church of England itself, which, as Lord Bacon once said, "is the eye of England." For as we look back on the history of *private* patronage, with which we are here chiefly concerned, we see that it is really the history of endowments and of our whole parochial system, so that it is difficult to touch one without affecting the whole.

It is important to observe that we are not responsible for what was done with respect to Church property in the days of Henry the Eighth. No one is called upon to defend what was then done; but we cannot but feel that God has overruled much that was wrong and indefensible. The result of so much property having fallen into the hands of private individuals is that the Church is more firmly rooted in the affections of the people, and that there is a variety of clergymen such as no other church, perhaps, possesses, and which is of the greatest importance in the case of a national Church.

The chief difficulty, I have said, is with respect to private patronage. I think there are two reasons why private patronage should be retained:—

(1.) To attack it is to attack the Church itself; the roots of the two are intertwined.

(2.) The system of patronage, as it now exists, is the means of attaching to the Church a large number of laymen of wealth, position, and influence, whose sympathies are in many cases secured to the Church, because they feel they have a solemn trust to discharge in the administration of their patronage.

Nor does it appear to me that the *transfer* of patronage ought to be forbidden. In the case of advowsons appendant, it is right that the purchaser of the manor should not only have the estate but that which belongs to it. He purchases the farms and cottages on the manor, and it is but reasonable to suppose that he is more likely than any other person to realise his responsibility with regard to the spiritual need of those who live on the estate. Again, if you make advowsons inalienable, you subject them to the risk of falling into very improper hands. Look at the changes which take place in families. A family once distinguished becomes decayed, and is now represented by a day-labourer: who would wish to see church patronage vested in such a person?

It is not the transfer of patronage, but the conditions on which it can be effected, which ought to be the subject of legislation. It is no easy task to ascertain clearly what simony is. You must consult the canon law, and sundry Acts of Parliament; the law on the subject needs to be made more clear and definite. For instance, it is simony to sell a vacant living. But what mean the advertisements in the circulars of advertising agents, announcing livings to be sold, "with immediate possession guaranteed?" If this can be done with impunity, it is either because the law is grossly defective, or because there are no adequate means of enforcing it. If we desire to know what ought to be the chief aim of legislation in order to stop nefarious traffic in livings, we cannot do better than consult the circulars issued by the agents; for they are the greatest offenders. One of them says: "The essential feature in the sale of Church property is undoubtedly privacy, and this is entirely frustrated if the matter is indiscriminately published about." The aim, then, of legislation should be to ensure *publicity*, as far as possible, in all these transactions.

Mention has been made to-day of advowsons donative. A single donative in the hands of an agent may be made to do any amount of dirty work. Suppose that a clergyman wishes to make way for a purchaser. In order to do this, he

accepts a donative to day so as to vacate his living; he then resigns the donative to morrow; so that this donative may be made use of by its owner to carry out a second corrupt resignation in the same week. Donatives are not numerous; but, by making them subject to episcopal jurisdiction, like other advowsons, you would effect a far greater amount of good than can be estimated by their number.

In order to make the law which prohibits sale during a vacancy really beneficial, the sale of presentations apart from advowsons should be declared absolutely illegal; otherwise the effect of the existing law is that when the advowson or next presentation is about to be sold, the living is filled up with an aged incumbent, whose sole recommendation is that his death may be shortly expected. Any law against the sale of next presentations should impose penalties not only upon patron and presentee, but also upon such persons as shall be proved to have wilfully aided them in the commission of simony.

Previous speakers have expressed doubts as to the possibility of effectual legislation. But I venture to believe that the public conscience is becoming so quickened on this subject, that legislation is more probable every session of Parliament. Let me, then, repeat some of the excellent suggestions made in the report of the Convocation Committee, and in the Bishop of Peterborough's bill. At every sale of an advowson let the deed of conveyance be enrolled by the purchaser, and let the purchaser not be allowed to present till so many years after the date of enrolment. Should a vacancy occur meanwhile, let the bishop present.

Let every patron, when he presents, sign a declaration that he has not purchased the right of presentation since the last avoidance, and that there has been no illegal contract, or illegal bond of resignation; and let a similar declaration be made by the presentee, in lieu of the existing declaration and oath against simony.

I pass now to the *exchange of livings*. We have all seen from time to time exchanges which have proved a great advantage to both parties, and to their parishes. An elderly man who has long been vicar of a large parish, and who no longer feels equal to his work, exchanges with a young man who has the charge of a small country living, and is well fitted for a laborious post. Such an arrangement is calculated to advance the best interest of the Church. On the other hand, if facilities for effecting an exchange were much increased, it might foster in the clergy a restless spirit, and instead of engaging heartily in the work committed to them, they might be tempted to occupy their thoughts too frequently with the question, whether they would not be happier or more useful in some other field of labour.

With regard to the voice which parishioners might have in the appointment of their minister, I am glad that the idea of popular election has not been proposed for discussion. Popular election would entail upon many clergymen both moral and financial ruin; and a contest would involve as much violence and corruption in many cases as attend a Parliamentary election.

Still the parishioners might, and, I think, should, have some voice in a proceeding which is of so much importance to their highest interests.

It might be well if in every case in which the bishop is willing to institute, he should cause a notice like a *Si quis* to be read in the parish church on three consecutive Sundays (as in the case of banns of marriage); during the weeks in which the notice is read, it might also be affixed to the door of the church; the notice, and the certificate of its having been read and affixed might be returned to the bishop's registry before he can institute; a further period of fourteen days might be allowed to give time for objections to be sent in by any three or more parishioners; the bishop, either alone or with assessors, to decide the question.

This is the course suggested by the Bishop of Peterborough in his bill. It would

make parishioners feel that they had some voice in the election of their minister, and would, I believe, tend to promote the popularity, usefulness, and stability of our beloved Church.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE, M.P.

MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,—I believe I may appeal to your experience in the House to which you belong, as I can to my own, to the first question a man ought to ask himself when he presses an organic change. Is it not—What am I ready to put in the place of it? In the case of patronage, this is a question which ought most emphatically to be asked. We see the evils of the present system. They are gross and palpable. Not one word that Mr. Oakley said was too strong for the scandalous agency system. I should be very glad to hang at least one clerical agent, as an example: and I have a man in my eye, not long ago an incumbent in an eastern county,—whose name has lately appeared in the newspapers in a very scandalous way. Before we move we must consider that the system of patronage—for good or bad—is rooted in the Church of England; and if we alter it—and it does require alteration—we must so alter it as to leave the Church of England the same Church of England as it was before. Deeply rooted as it is, it might be shaken by too radical a change. Mr. Stanhope and Mr. Goe struck the right key when they reminded us that variety was the type of the Church of England. Variety is the magna charta of the liberties both of the clergy and of the laity; it is the guarantee of sound religion, sound learning, and regulated freedom in our Church of England. I am sure your grace would agree with me that it would be a bad day for the Church of England if the Archbishop of Canterbury or of York could say what the Archbishop of Rouen said not long since:—"My clergy are a regiment of soldiers; when I tell them to march, they march." I am sure there is as little likelihood of your grace saying this, as of your grace appearing as I saw the Archbishop of Rouen, heading a pilgrimage in mitre and cope along the streets of his archiepiscopal city. At the same time, the occupying influence of livings is a most righteous element in our system, and it must hold its own place. The French system shows the danger of exclusive episcopal patronage; while leaving too little to the bishop is equally to be deprecated. To come to the point. The remedy for existing evils is, I believe, to be sought not so much in attacking the sources of patronage, as dealing with your parson when you have caught him. Keep the law of patronage much as it is; but when a man has been appointed, let there be ready opportunities, and an efficient process for testing and trying, and, if unhappily needful, of rejecting him. I do not mean merely action by the bishop, *in camera*, but I indicate some well-regulated machinery such as the ordinary advised and assisted by chancellor and chapter, under whom a man who is unlearned, or unscrupulous, or intemperate, or worn out, and who is merely put in as a dummy and a stop-gap, may be kept out. After all, publicity and public opinion will go very far to meet the present evils. Mr. Oakley urged the prohibition of the sale of the advowson, excepting with the estate. May I ask him this question—If so, how is he to deal with the case of an advowson which is in the wrong hands, when the right hands desire to secure it—when it belongs to a stranger, and the squire wants to get it? That scheme of his would block out the squire. You may suggest an exception of permissible sale to a landowner, but if there are two or three landowners bidding, how are you to meet the case? Popular opinion would resent this apparent monopoly of the market. Or again, how are you to prevent a man getting a colourable right of purchase by obtaining a forty shilling freehold to

entitle him to bid? Legislation is not the easy matter which it seems to be on the platform of a Church Congress. Mr. Goe advocated the delay of the power of presentation for some fixed time after acquisition. For heaven's sake do not go in for this: it would often prevent the right man from buying, and set the wrong one dodging. A man who wants the advowson to rebuild the church, or plant a school, if he can only buy the living adjacent to his newly-acquired estate, with deferred endowment, will refuse to pay for a benefit which his heir will more probably reap. Some people actually said something about the undesirability of college patronage. There, again, I am desirous of coming to an issue with them. I am so thorough a believer in variety, that I would rather maintain undesirable patronage than risk cutting short any that was desirable—but I deny that college patronage is undesirable. Look at the immortal roll of great men in the Church of England who have gone from their colleges to their livings. The main evil has been done away with in another way. The case which people put their fingers down upon is that of some senior fellow of the college, who goes from the convocation or the common room to his living; or that of an old worn-out bachelor who retires and taking to himself a wife, has to learn the meaning of parish school and the nursery on one and the same day. But the University Tests Act has given these cases a hard blow, and has with the secularisation of fellowships compelled the colleges to go a-field for eligible presentees. It is a common practice amongst those persons who deal with this question to argue that, whilst the sale of livings in some form or other may be kept, the sale of next presentation should be made illegal. It is with great respect, and feeling my own insignificance, my own isolation in the presence of the great, and wise, and good people, who say this, that I own I cannot see my way to accepting their position. I look at the matter practically. There are circumstances in which an alienation of the next presentation has been good for the parish, and there are others where it has been scandalous. The abolition of the legal sale of the next presentation would wipe out every case where it has been desirable, leaving those scandalous cases as they are, but only infinitely more scandalous and more mischievous. Where the sale of next presentation is scandalous and mischievous is not in the case of a parish in which a man who does his duty to God and his fellow-parishioners wishes to put some one else in of more capacity than he can compass, but in which some one who has had a hard time of it at Doncaster or Newmarket, or has gone into a company limited or unlimited, or has been doing something more immoral, is obliged to sell his next presentation to meet his losses. Now you cannot make me believe that any Acts of Parliament would prevent him from doing so, as long as there are touts, and agents, and scamps in the world to manage the sale for him. The sale would be effected, only it would be done in the dark, and would be perjury *plus* corruption; or a worse kind of parson than now would be put in, because of course the man who could profit by such a transaction would be sure to be a blackguard. Then, again, there would be the case of the embarrassed man, who had a conscience left, and who would be driven to serve for ever the old estate and the old living, whose right he would only part with at the next turn. My remedy is the contrary one. I travel along with Mr. Goe, only I advance further than he does, and urge publicity in this case as in every other—publicity in the case of selling a next presentation, as well as in the advowson. This affair must be recorded in the bishop's register, with time and publicity for lodging objections. Something has been said of exchanges. I approach the question, with the personal feelings of a patron; and my opinion is, that while exchanges may, and are very often, most desirable, still the feeling which lurks, I believe, in some clerical minds that the clergy have a free right to exchange—to them the question is one piece of sacerdotalism which my Protestant nature rebels against. Is the patron nobody? Is the man who feels

he has striven to do his duty to his God and to his parish, by putting the right man there, not to be consulted? Is his parson to come to him and say: "Mr. So-and-so, of the diocese of Truro, wishes to exchange with me." What should the patron say? I should suggest: "Mr. So-and-so may be an angel from the Land's End; but I know nothing of him. I put you into the living because you preached what I thought would tell on your parish; because you tell the necessity of doing, or not doing, this or that; because I thought your views agreed generally with mine and those of my farmers; and how do I know that this Mr. So-and-so, from Truro, resembles you?" There are really six parties to an exchange. There is the bishop, the two parsons, the two patrons. I must conclude with what to my mind is the least defensible detail in our law of patronage, namely, bonds of resignation. They seem to me an essentially immoral thing, for they involve a man parading himself as a freeholder when he is only a tenant-at-will. How can you alter this? If you abolish the system altogether, you introduce that which is a still greater evil—some old, effete imbecile is intercepted from the undertakers, and is put into the living to hold it for a few weeks, till the squire's boy is ripe for it. My remedy is another one. When a man wants to keep a living open for any given person, let him say so openly—there is nothing to be ashamed of in it—and let the bishop have the right to put in a *locum tenens* for a limited number of years, with the rights of the parson, and with his income; and also let this *local tenens* be chosen from among the incumbents or curates who had been in the diocese for at least a dozen years. This will be at once a pleasant windfall, and a pledge of the patron's sincerity. I have not thrown this scheme into formal shape, but I have suggested it before, and I feel bound to mention it again, as I think that, with due consideration, something might be made of the idea.

DISCUSSION.

REV. HARRY JONES.

IN the few fragmentary remarks permissible in so short a period as five minutes I can merely touch the different subjects brought before you in the exhaustive papers and speeches you have heard. With reference to the first question—the sale of livings—brought before the meeting, it has struck me that the accompaniments of the sale are worse than the transfer of the patronage. The sale of the living seems to be an offence in which the smell is worse than the poison. The offensive recommendations which frequently accompany the proposal that a living shall be sold, are just those which make it stink in the nostrils of the public. With regard to the patronage of livings and how they should be disposed of, I am strongly inclined to believe with one or two of the previous speakers, although not with Mr. Oakley, that the patronage of the bishops would be increased at a very considerable risk to the present condition of the Church. I am inclined to think that with respect of all kinds of patronage, diversity is one of the great charms and safeguards of the Church. As to the veto, I cannot help believing that the provision which already exists in the Church might be better applied. We have already an opportunity given to parishioners, or to the laity at least, for the exercise of some veto. I think the suggestion of Mr. Goe was most admirable, and that something of the nature of a "*Si quis*" should be read, not merely in the parish church when the person is to be ordained, but afterwards when a clergyman is to be presented to a living. Something similar to this should be read to the parishioners among whom he is going to officiate. With regard to exchanges I should

be glad to make a remark. I should be very sorry to see the facilities for exchange diminished. I believe that a great deal of fresh life, a great deal of fresh interest, and of fresh energy might be brought into the Church by the extension of the present facilities for exchange. It is not merely, as one of the previous speakers has told you, that square men should be shifted to square holes; but sometimes the square man stays so long in the square hole, and the round man remains so long in the round hole, that he becomes sick of the parish. He and his parishioners get tired of one another, and so it results that a man goes on for ever sitting on the same eggs and incubating nothing. The parishioners know all about him, and he knows too much about them. Many of his white sheep are grey, and all his grey sheep are black; and it may possibly end in this—that a state of things exist in the parish in which all the parochial saints are spoiled, and none of the parochial sinners have a chance, and the clergyman himself is condemned to live the rest of his life over the cesspools of his own mistakes.

MR. T. COLLINS, Knaresbro'.

EVERY speaker, I think, has agreed in this—that the present arrangement under which divers modes exist whereby clergy obtain and keep in their benefices is a great advantage to the Church of England. And, I think it would be a wise thing if the Church Congress and members of Parliament in both Houses of the Legislature would look rather to putting restraints upon the person who is presented, than to exercising any alteration with reference to the right of presenting. If you once get into the question as to the fitness of the person to present—whether it is because he has given a sum of money or for any other reason—we shall be launched into a series of difficulties. What we have to look to is not the character of the person who presents, but the sort of man who is presented; we have to take care of that. And for the life of me I cannot see that because a person has bought a next presentation he is likely to make a worse appointment than a person who has inherited the right. I have never bought one, but I have inherited one: I have a presentation bought by my great-grandfather, and I have presented the best man I could find. But I do not see why, supposing I had given one thousand pounds or two thousand pounds for this next presentation, I should have been less likely to have exercised the discretion wisely. I should have thought that the fact of buying it would have given me a stronger interest in it than through having inherited it. I do not think you can separate—either logically or with fairness or with advantage to the Church—the abolition of the right of next presentation from that of selling the advowson. It would not be wise to say—“You must not sell the advowson;” for you would be having, perhaps, a presentation to a living, if inalienable, lapsing into hands utterly unfit on all accounts to exercise it. And you cannot do this; if you are to have lay presentation at all, you ought not to fetter the exercise of it by checking the sale of either next presentation or of the advowson itself. Churchmen would be wise to give the bishops far more power than they have in checking improper persons being presented, whether persons disqualified from weakness of physical powers or otherwise. I would vest in the bishop of the diocese a much larger power than they have now got. Many of the scandals would be then stopped, and a greater advantage to the Church would accrue by these things being done openly. One thing there is upon which we are all agreed, and that is to give facility for exchanges. With reference to purchase in the army, that was abolished; but the right of exchange without questions being asked why or wherefore, was given by a subsequent Act of Parliament. I should like to see the right of exchange

dealt with in a similar way. I would allow no exchange unless the bishop and patron were satisfied. If they are, I do not see why a man who wishes to exercise his calling in Devonshire should be almost compelled to remain in Yorkshire; or why a Yorkshireman should be, as it were, obliged to remain in Devonshire, if he wishes to work in his native county. What is a curacy but a system of perpetual exchange? Why should there be one law for the curate and another law for the incumbent? The real fact is that we want the whole of the laws with reference to patronage and simony revised and based upon common sense. There is nothing simoniacal in the fact of a man giving so much money for the right of exercising his cure with the consent of the bishop. I know a man who has built a church and schools, and whose charitable donations in that and other parishes are very large. He wanted a presentation for his brother, and he bought a next presentation. Is anyone the worse for that? I hold nothing of the kind. I do hope, therefore, we shall not have any interference with the sale either of advowsons or next presentations.

Rev. Canon TREVOR.

I HAVE not sent up my name to speak on this subject, and rather think your Grace must have inherited my card from your predecessor in the chair at the morning meeting. Being called upon, I can only say that I agree very much in the remarks of my friend Mr. Collins. No form of patronage is entirely free from objection, and the best corrective is to preserve as many forms as possible, in order to keep the balance. I have myself been the subject of Crown patronage at York and of lay patronage in this town, while I owe my present benefice to the generosity of my diocesan; I can have no objection therefore to either form. I conceive that lay patronage is absolutely essential to the maintenance of the Establishment; and I cannot understand how it is possible to deprive a lay patron of the power of transferring his trust to another. As long as one person is willing to sell and another to buy, the lawyers will find a way of effecting the bargain. I see no difference in this respect between a next presentation and the perpetual advowson; and I fear that the attempt to distinguish them would only result in hampering the more conscientious by difficulties which less scrupulous persons would easily break through. I think it unjust to brand all such purchases with the name of Simony, when the Ecclesiastical Commissioners constantly grant the first presentation to a liberal benefactor in consideration of his building, or helping to build, a new church. This is precisely the same thing in principle, since all private patrons are the legal representatives of the original founders. There is no more harm in a gentleman purchasing the next presentation to an ancient benefice, with the intention of presenting a particular person, than in his giving a sum of money to the building or endowing of a new church, in order to obtain the first presentation from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. I submit that the proper remedy against abuses is to increase the power of the bishop in the matter of institution. The courts of law, in their anxiety for the rights of property, are apt to disregard the spiritual trust. All lay patronage is acquired under the condition of presenting a fit and proper clerk. This condition the courts have reduced to a mere technical qualification, of which they make themselves the judges. But the bishop is the original and proper judge of the qualifications of the clerk, and he ought to have more liberty in the exercise of his constitutional veto.

REV. C. B. JACKSON.

THE remarks I have to make on the subject before us will be chiefly addressed to the two latter portions; but before I pass on to them I should like to say that I have always entertained strong objections to being presented to a living purchased for me. I might have had such preferment many years ago. When serving in a laborious parish, friends of mine offered to purchase a living for me, and I declined it for many reasons. At the same time I do not think it would be right in all cases to prohibit the purchase of next presentations. For instance,—here is a merchant or a successful tradesman who has a son that he has designed for some lay pursuit; but he finds him set upon entering holy orders and devoting his life to the service of God in the Church of England. The father says:—"I have no interest; my boy may be very good, but I do not know that he has any such special talent as would attract the notice of patrons; I should, however, like to see him settled before I die: I will therefore buy him a presentation." Such a person is probably far more fit to present than the person who is willing to sell a nomination. In the question of exchange, every one who has had any lengthened opportunities of observation must have found that there is a very great waste of power in the Church of England, inasmuch as we have young men full of energy, full of ability, sometimes put where they have no scope for the exercise of their energies and abilities. We have, on the other hand, men who either from the first, or in process of time have become, disqualified for holding large charges,—men who are groaning under a sense that they have duties to perform which they know they have no ability adequately to discharge. We should have greater facilities for bringing about exchanges in such cases. It is most undesirable, however, that these clergymen should have themselves to seek out exchanges; because if anything is calculated to deaden a man's spirituality and sense of mission, I believe it to be the consciousness that he is not where God's good providence, but where his own self-will, has placed him. It is most desirable that rural deans and others who have an intimate knowledge of the clergy of the neighbourhood, should make themselves acquainted with such cases, and should bring them before the bishops or other patrons; and should point out where men are being wasted or oppressed by their position, and so be instrumental in bringing about desirable exchanges. Exchange should come from without; it should be suggested rather than sought; and then the clergy, on entering upon a new charge, would feel that they were in the place to which they had been called, in God's providence. As regards the veto, I hold very strongly that veto should be lodged somewhere; but not in the parishioners, not in the congregation, not in the communicants. There are three parties interested in the matter; there is the patron, there is the patron's nominee, and there are the parishioners. No one has a right to be judge and jury in his own case. What I hold is, that it is most desirable that there should be some body, comprising the laity as well as the clergy, who should be a sort of court of appeal in such cases. I do not think that it would be very often that a veto would be exercised; but the very fact of its existence—the possibility of its being exercised—would have a great tendency to prevent many improper appointments. But supposing a person has been nominated to a parish, and the parishioners, whether more or few, feel themselves aggrieved, they should have the opportunity of stating their grievance to some such independent body—it might be to the Diocesan Church Council as it exists in the diocese of Lichfield. Such a court of appeal would see that equal justice was meted out. This, I feel, is one of the crying, the burning questions of the day; and if we can satisfy parishioners that all reasonable objections to clergy who are

to minister to them shall be heard, and if clearly made out that they shall be relieved from being committed to the spiritual charge of a clergyman whom they can only regard as an incubus over them, for they know not how long, it will have a great tendency to relieve great dissatisfaction that prevails among many of the laity; and they would rally round the Church in such a way that, no matter what her enemies might devise, the Church of England would be protected in all her rights and privileges.

The Venerable Archdeacon CUST.

So much has been said in deprecation of the sale of livings, and so much indignation has arisen on account of the abuses attending some of those sales, that it really requires a considerable amount of courage to attempt to come forward to say anything in their excuse or their advocacy. But I think there is a great deal to be said on the other side of the question. Canon Trevor has spoken very prudently on the matter; and there is one thing which ought to be borne in mind, and that is, that these sales in regard to patronage have been carried on in conformity with the laws of the country; advowsons have been bought from time immemorial upon the strength of the laws. The Lord Chancellor was allowed by Parliament a few years ago to sell a very considerable part of the Crown patronage, and there was not that stipulation, which a former speaker has implied is generally necessary, made that the livings be sold to owners of property in the parish; for I know there was a Chancellor's living, in my own neighbourhood, which was sold to a person who had no connection whatever with the parish. What we wish is to see clergymen from different classes introduced into the parish. It is a great advantage to a parish to have a person brought in as the clergyman who is possessed of some property besides what he might derive from his living. We all know that it is a great advantage to a parish to have a clergyman of some private means. Therefore, is it not desirable rather to encourage the introduction of such incumbents, and is not this likely to be done by allowing parents, or trustees, or guardians to spend in the purchase of an advowson, or even a presentation, a portion of that money which would otherwise naturally go to the young man for whom that presentation is purchased? A great deal has been said against that; and I think if the Bishop of Peterborough's Bill had been carried into effect it would have almost prevented parents or guardians spending a portion of the money they intended for the son, or for the one for whom they were the trustees, in the purchase of a living. Was that desirable? I think not. The very fact of a young man being wishful that a portion of his patrimony should be expended, not for the purchase of a spiritual office, but for the power of exercising those duties which belong to the spiritual office into which he was already admitted when he was ordained, ought to be commended as an indication of predisposition for ministerial work. There ought not to be a confusion between the purchase of a spiritual office and the purchase of the power of exercising that spiritual office; and I say that that is what is done when a presentation or an advowson is purchased. Of course, to purchase ordination would be an act of simony too shocking to contemplate. No such thing could be thought of now. I have only time to say further that I do think it is most desirable that the laws of simony should be in some way or other placed on a much more satisfactory footing than they are now.

MR. RALPH FLETCHER, of Atherton.

I TAKE a different view of the question from that of some of the last speakers; I agree more with the readers of the earlier papers. I am an uncompromising opponent of the sale of advowsons and of next presentations in any form. To all who, like myself, have seen the walls of our towns placarded with huge Liberatorist placards, it must cause great grief and many heartburnings to think that, while to the rest of their allegations we can give a bold denial, and can prove them to be a tissue of lies, we cannot withstand their allegations with regard to the sale of livings. My idea of Church patronage is, that it should be considered and administered solely as a *trust*, and in no way as *property*. I cannot agree that the right of appointing a clergyman to minister in some particular portion of Christ's vineyard should be looked upon in any way as property: it should be considered as a solemn trust from God, committed to our charge for the benefit of our fellow-creatures, and which cannot be parted with for money. It seems to me that God will regard it no more right that a patron should use such a trust as a means of putting money into his pocket, than it would be for him to appropriate other people's property for his own uses. I consider that the holders of the advowsons of our Church livings are simply trustees for the appointment of suitable persons to such livings, and that they have no more right to make such appointments a means of their own personal aggrandisement, than have ordinary trustees to spend on themselves the money which they hold in trust for others. I quite agree with previous speakers as to the benefits which ensue from our present varied forms of Church patronage, and as to the desirability of retaining *private patronage*. No one seems to me more likely to know the best sort of clergyman to suit the wants of a parish than the principal landowner in a county, or the principal employer of labour in a manufacturing district. I hope that Mr. Beresford Hope will not prove right in supposing that it is practically impossible to make any essential change in the present system of buying and selling livings if private patronage is retained; but if he is right, then I, for one, say, rather than retain the abuses of the present system, and the great scandal and injury to the Church that arise therefrom, let us do away with private patronage altogether. If the buying and selling livings is *wrong*, as I hold it is, we have no right to say that we must not do away with the present system because on the whole we think it leads to *good results*, and that if done away with some worse evil may arise—as this, surely, is the doctrine attributed to the Jesuits, of “doing evil that good may come!” There are two great evils that arise from the purchase system—1st, that many livings of small value do not get augmented, because those who would otherwise contribute to their augmentation object to do anything which would allow the patrons to pocket larger sums by the sale of such augmented livings; and 2nd, that parishioners never can look on their minister with the same respect, when they know that he owes his position among them to either purchase or favouritism, as they would do if they knew he had been selected because the patron thought him the best man for the place. Instead of thinking it justifiable, as some of the speakers have said, for a man to buy a living for the sake of putting into it his son, or nephew, or other relative (setting him up in business, in fact!) I consider it only another form of evil which arises from the purchase system, as, in my opinion, no one should present to a living either his son or anyone else, unless he honestly considers him to be, not only a good, suitable, and God-fearing man, but also the *best man* he can find for that particular place.

Mr. WILTSHIRE, of Welwyn, Herts.

I HAVE asked the liberty to address the meeting for a few minutes, because I think sufficient distinction has not been made between the right of presentation and that of institution. It has been concluded that the sale of the advowson includes the power of putting into the living a person, whether he be fit or not. I do not think that if we could manage to guard the right of the bishop in refusing the institution of unfit persons, it is of much importance how that person comes under the cognisance of the bishop. Whether the advowson be sold by auction or not, matters very little, provided we get the right man at the last. I suggest that the Diocesan Conference should select a patronage committee, into whose hands should be committed the testimonials of any person who is nominated to a living by the owner of an advowson, or of a next presentation. The archdeacons, the rural deans, and the two representatives of the communicants should be included in the committee. Let us distinguish carefully between the right of nomination and that of institution. I was recently looking over a dictionary of ecclesiastical antiquities, and I found in some parts "Roman Catholic Church"—a Church which does not fail on the side of attributing too small rights to the bishop in the diocesan synod—and I found that one of their duties was to appoint divers committees. In the appointment of each committee the bishop had a voice, and over each he presided. But there was one committee in which he had no voice, and over which he did not preside; and that was precisely a patronage committee. If something of that kind were introduced into the Church we should gain a great point. If such a scheme were adopted, the patronage committee would be well informed of the particular circumstances of each case, so that a square man might not be placed in a round hole.

Rev. G. LEWTHWAITE, Adel, near Leeds.

I CAN now only briefly reply to some of the fallacies which have raised their heads again to-day. We have been warned with much bathos of the danger of seeing patronage for ever entailed in the pauperised family of a spendthrift squire, if its transfer be made, as of old was the custom, only passable as *appendant* to the manor or estate. The fallacy is transparent: for, if the patronage be attached to the property, with the property it will go to its new possessor. Again, the minimum rateable value of an estate, which might carry an advowson, could be fixed by law, and special provision made to meet cases which have been long the subject of *gross* sale. Nor again is it found in practice that the men who have invested money, often borrowed, in the benefices which they hold, are the most liberal in the support of their Church work.

A plea has been urged in behalf of the trader from an unexpected quarter, that it is desirable that the sons of men of means and position should be encouraged to enter the ministry by the knowledge that preferment is thus being provided for them. But would not this be of the very essence of simony? It is to be hoped that they and all others will enter the ministry from a higher motive, or they had far better keep out. Moreover it may be observed that such men have already an advantage in the race for preferment; for patrons prefer such connection.

It is urged that Lord Westbury's Act, for the sale of poor chancellor's livings to improve their endowment, gives some legal sanction to the purchase of advowsons with

a view to next presentation, for one is known to have been purchased by a person who had no connection with the parish. This is only a proof that the fears which were expressed at the time were not without reason. The objection was met by the assurance that the poor livings would only be purchased by persons interested in the parish; and, though in their case it was held unnecessary to insert the clause, the absence of which has been made the basis of this argument, the limitation was inserted in respect of the better benefices, besides another clause testifying the averseness of the legislature to such trading. The livings sold under that Act were barred from being re-sold for five years. No doubt Lord Westbury was a financier. But if the result of his Act be to put the increment, and perhaps some more of the endowments, into the pockets of traders, the Church would have done far better without it; and surely no Act of Lord Westbury's can tarnish the purity of the Church's laws any more than an act of his can diminish the dignity of the woollack.

We are told that the law of *simony* is unintelligible. I never found any difficulty about it. Of course in this, as in most other matters, there are two necessary conditions to understanding, a little painstaking and an honest desire. Those who have not the latter will hardly exert much diligence to inform themselves.

We are, then, not surprised at the evidence of the respected solicitor before the Lords' Committee on the difficulty he had had in convincing clerks of the stringency of the oath against simony: for they had evidently come to him with the intention of evading the law, having possibly been before instructed by lawyers in the sense that that is lawful which can be done without incurring its penalties. In this sense we must understand those who have spoken to-day of certain sales being lawful. Nor can we accept even the solicitor himself as an unbiassed witness respecting the nature of Simony, or the law on the subject, except in the above lawyers' sense; seeing that, by his own admission, for nearly fifty years he had been frequently concerned in sales and purchases of advowsons and next turns. The delicate flavour of the moral sense, like the bloom on the summer fruit, can hardly help being seared by frequent touch.

We have again heard the fallacy that the purchase of patronage with a view to the incumbency is not Simony, because it is not the identical thing which Simon the Magician attempted; though it is admitted that "to purchase ordination would be an act of simony too shocking to contemplate." But does not the purchase of a cure more directly affect souls? And is it not more nearly identical with Simon's attempt, than that which is admitted to be so shocking? For "the gift of God," which he coveted, probably for temporal ends, was not grace for himself, but the power to convey grace; and is not this more conferred by institution to a cure of souls, than even by ordination itself? For the parson is not merely the channel, but, in the Church's order, an exclusive channel of all the graces conveyed through an ordained ministry, whether in sacraments or in the public or private administration of the Word.

And now the cry is raised of inconsistency in the law of Simony, on the mere assumption that its successful evasions are as good law as the law itself. So the few points in the Church's defences which the adversary has been unable to turn he would under-mine by falsehood, and by a general assault along the whole line to the cry of inconsistency, plant the banner of Mammon triumphant on the battlements of the Church: and with what result? It is comparatively a small thing to say that the legal sanction of trading would be a huge act of confiscation of revenues dedicated to the service of God. But the adversary pleads that he would place the conscientious on the same vantage ground as the unscrupulous. It is not denied that some such have been aforetime beguiled by his wiles, and that, in a time of inconsideration they have done what they have afterwards deeply

regretted ; but now that the trumpet note has for some time sounded clear, they will have to take their place with those who know that no State enactment can dispense them from what they believe to be the law of God, revealed by his Word and in his Church ; and the Establishment, become not merely “an house of merchandise,” but, according to the word of the Master’s deeper sorrow, “a den of” sacrilegious “thieves,” will fall, abhorred by the religious feeling of the country, necessarily forsaken of those who would earnestly desire to be her friends to the last.

WEDNESDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 2nd, 1878.

The Venerable Archdeacon BLUNT took the Chair at 7 P.M.

MARRIAGE LAW AS AFFECTING THE CHURCH.

PAPERS.

REV. CANON TEMPLE.

It cannot be too strongly laid down that the essence of marriage lies in mutual consent, and in nothing else ;* such consent being of course understood at the time on both sides as given not to any unhallowed temporary union, but to a permanent lifelong bond. And in a simple state of society, wherever such consent has been once freely given and interchanged by persons capable of giving and acting on it, no one, whether priest or lawyer, will dare to say that such marriage is invalid. Though however this be so as regards the root idea of the marriage tie, still where Christianity has reached and civilization is known, the Churchman has a right to say that bare human consent apart from the blessing of God is an impious thing : and the statesman has a right to say that the acceptance of a simple, which may even be a secret agreement, as equivalent to a formal act, affecting the legitimacy of children and the division of real property, is, in the interests of society, a dangerous thing. It is reasonable, therefore, that the rights of the married and the freedom of the unmarried should be guarded by the same considerations of religion as we submit to voluntarily, and the same restraints of law as we accept under legitimate compulsion, in matters affecting life and property and the general conduct of human affairs. At the same time a wise Churchman will admit that a marriage contracted without the blessing of God as conveyed in any authorised ministration, though an irreligious and too possibly a sinful marriage, is not an invalid one ; and a wise statesman will take care that the legal formalities with which he surrounds the matrimonial bond be as few and as simple as possible. These last indeed should be directed to two objects only, viz. :—to the

* “Consensus, non concubitus, facit matrimonium.” See Report of Commissioners, Appendix p. 62.

prevention of marriage between persons unfit for any reason to contract it ; and to the requirement of such formal evidence as shall abundantly secure that all persons, men and women, shall be distinctly known among their friends and associates, according to the truth of the case, as either married or not married. Subject to these considerations, it is manifestly important, on moral grounds, that the utmost facility should be given to the contraction of honourable marriage. What precise legal regulations, whether ecclesiastical or civil, will in the best manner and with the least of irksome restraint meet the conditions above detailed, is a problem for Churchmen and statesmen to solve. The conviction that under existing circumstances in our own country that problem has not yet met with the best solution possible, prompts the writing of this paper. The subject occupied the attention of a Royal Commission, which reported so long ago as 1868. That commission made certain recommendations, some of them very excellent, others more questionable, which Lord Chelmsford has repeatedly pressed on the attention of successive administrations. There is a general impression that Her Majesty's present Government will be prepared to deal with the question when they are satisfied that they have full and definite information as to what just policy, and the popular wish in accordance with just policy, really require ; but considering what important interests are involved in the matter, it is not to be wondered at if they regard what is to be done as something to be done once for all, not as in any way a subject for tentative or experimental legislation.

What first strikes us is the utter absence of anything like uniformity in the law of marriage for the United Kingdom. I will not add force to the statement of this divergence, as I easily might do, by including the colonies in my description. But to begin with Ireland :* there are no fewer than seven different methods of contracting marriage, each method guarded by legislation of a severely deterrent character. It is felony for a parochial clergyman to celebrate a marriage which a Roman Catholic priest may celebrate. It is felony for the Roman priest to celebrate a marriage which may be lawfully celebrated by a parochial clergyman, a Presbyterian minister, or any other Nonconformist minister ; indeed this not so very long ago was a hanging matter. And it is felony for the Presbyterian or other Nonconformist to celebrate a marriage which the parochial clergyman may celebrate,

Turning to Scotland, we find strangely enough that the old canon law of Europe, which recognised mutual consent between capable persons as the one requisite for a valid marriage, and left for the most part the evidence of such consent having been really given to take care of itself, has found a refuge in that most Protestant of countries. Marriages there are regular or irregular. For regular marriages, which may be celebrated by any priest or minister, Conformist or Nonconformist, banns must have been put up in the kirk of the parish in which the parties or one of them have or has

* Report of Commissioners, p. xxiv.

resided for six weeks. And these banns must be preceded by a certificate of various particulars which unhappily our English law does not require. The banns must be published three times in the kirk before divine service, but for an extra fee, which is most commonly paid, the three publications can all be made on the same day before the congregation assembles.

Irregular marriages are when the parties acknowledge each other as man and wife before witnesses; or when a promise to marry at some future time is followed by cohabitation: in this latter case, however, the promise must be in writing. Moreover, in the popular mind at any rate, presumption of marriage is in Scotland allowed to be established by habit and repute; and it is even doubtful whether the courts would permit the fact to be disputed after the death of the parties. The number of irregular marriages as compared with that of regular marriages is very insignificant, being somewhere about one in a thousand. But that does not prevent some persons from contending strongly for the principle, or others from suffering grievous, often undeserved, wrong.* In one notorious case, writings secretly exchanged between a man and a woman in Scotland were held by Lord Stowell to annul and render bigamous a marriage between the same man and another woman publicly celebrated four years afterwards in England, though the persons who exchanged those writings never lived together, and though the whole proceeding had been utterly unknown to their families and to the world.† In another, a marriage was held by the Scottish court and the House of Lords to have been well constituted, for giving the rights of widowhood to a woman and of legitimacy to children previously born, by words of present matrimonial consent exchanged between a man and the woman with whom he had hitherto lived as his mistress, the man contemplating suicide at the time, and committing it as soon as the words had been spoken.

* As will be seen from what has already been said, the Scotch law differs from the English, in that it allows marriage to legitimise children previously born out of wedlock. It is also to a certain extent free from the gross scandal which obtains in our own country, in that it does not permit the intermarriage of persons declared by the sentence of a Divorce court to have been guilty of adultery together. While on this subject I feel bound to say that the present state of English law, which in defiance (as I believe) both of Holy Scripture and of Church authority permits divorced persons, even guilty ones, to be married again in the lifetime of their lawful partners, is most painful. And its so-called concession to the clerical conscience, in not requiring any clergyman to marry such persons himself, but forcing him in case of refusal to grant the use of the parish church to another for the purpose, is still more painful, as seeming to suggest that the law of man may reasonably stand in opposition to the law of God, and claim the sanction of God's Church in doing so.

* Dalrymple, see Report of Commissioners, p. xviii.

† Macadam. *Ibid.*

Preliminaries to marriage in England are of three kinds :—either

1. The publication of banns : or
2. The procuring an episcopal licence : or
3. The obtaining a superintendent registrar's certificate or licence ; the certificate being receivable in lieu of banns at the parish church only if the clergyman be willing to accept it, the licence having nothing to do with the Church in any way.

In addition to these precautions it is further required that marriage be solemnised by a duly authorised person, and (unless by special dispensation from the Archbishop of Canterbury) in a building licensed for the purpose, and between the hours of eight and twelve in the forenoon.

It is commonly supposed that marriage by banns is of all methods, in Christian times at any rate, the most ancient. The earliest canon* on the subject which I have been able to find is one of the Westminster Synod in 1200 ; but that very canon recognises the bishop's licence as justifying a private marriage, which one would think could not from the nature of the case have been preceded by public banns.

There can be no doubt that, venerable as the institution of banns may be, yet in these modern days, as a precaution for preventing unlawful or clandestine marriages, it has in our great towns thoroughly broken down. How can this be otherwise in presence of such fact as the following ?

On December 10, 1865,† the banns of 125 couples were asked at St. Mary's, Lambeth.

On December 11, 1864, those of 189 couples were asked in the Cathedral church of Manchester.

On December 10, 1865, those of 202 couples were asked in the same Cathedral church.

Now the theory of the law is that the clergyman of the parish has gone to all the houses where the parties are alleged to reside, and has examined into all these cases. Can anything be more transparently absurd ?

Then very great difficulties have arisen, which ought to be fairly looked at both from the layman's and from the clergyman's side, from the fact of large ancient parishes, such as Leeds, Bradford, Sheffield, Halifax (the last named being about the size of Rutlandshire) having been divided into districts. In many such cases the people have old associations connected with the old churches which it is perilous in the extreme forcibly to break through. If they cannot put banns up and be married where their own religious and family feeling prompt, they will often go to the registrar's office, and so gradually become lost to the Church. A corresponding difficulty exists on the clergyman's side ; and this by no means, as some have thought, a mere matter of fees. I know of one large parish, where the vicar only last year

* Johnson's English Canons, Part ii. p. 91. Ed. Oxford.

† Registrar-General's evidence in appendix to Report of Commissioners, p. 51.

sent the fees to the various district churches, thereby mulcting himself to the amount of £150. But this did not satisfy the clergy of those churches. They felt, and properly felt, that their ecclesiastical status as independent incumbents was none the less infringed when the fees were returned.

The system of licences, for those who can afford it, works in my judgment exceedingly well. With two slight improvements it would be perfect. In the case of persons under age, the surrogate should require as a matter of course either the written consent of parent or guardian, or personal consent given in his own presence; and it should be the duty of some public officer to prosecute when false oaths or declarations have been made.

The superintendent registrar's certificate, as at present used (I speak not of his licence, with which the Church has no concern), though fenced in some particulars more thoroughly than Church banns, is not a satisfactory document. The registrar is much less likely to know anything about the parties beforehand than the parish clergyman is; and though his business is nominally conducted in a public office, it is really done in a corner. The notices of intended marriages are no longer read at the meetings of the guardians. They are simply filed and hung up in one of the rooms of the office, which very few of us have ever seen the inside of, and which none but the unusually curious are ever likely to penetrate. The registrar makes no inquiries outside his office.

The penalties which may at present be exacted from a clergyman solemnising marriage without licence obtained or banns duly asked, may almost be described as monstrous. A person aggrieved may take proceedings either in the ecclesiastical or the criminal court. If he obtains a conviction in the former,* the punishment is three years' suspension; and this was actually inflicted in one case where the negligence proved was of the most venial kind. But if a conviction be obtained in the criminal court,† the offender is liable to be attainted as a felon, and transported for fourteen years.

With respect to the legislation of the future, many Churchmen feel that first of all there is very much to be said for the French system of the Code Napoleon, which leaves all preliminaries, together with the legal contract itself, in the hands of civil officers, and then encourages Christian people, and of course Christian people only, to go to their own pastor for the Church's, which means the divine blessing, on the union. My objections to this are two in number:—

1. You throw away thereby the very considerable security against unlawful marriages which I have spoken of as now existing in the knowledge which a clergyman, at any rate in a country place, has of his parishioners.

2. Such a course would involve the entire re-casting of our marriage service, which at present treats the parties as unmarried

* Canon 62 of 1603. See Phillimore's *Ecclesiastical Law*, p. 774.

† 4 Geo. IV., c. 76. Phillimore, p. 780.

persons, and which is reduced to a solemn farce if the persons over whom it is used are legally man and wife already.

Nor should it be forgotten that such a change in the law would necessitate a revival of Church discipline which in these days might amount to a serious difficulty, in that we must refuse absolutely to give the holy communion to persons who notoriously had neglected to seek the divine blessing on their marriage.

My suggestions would be these :—

1. Publish banns as at present, requiring a preliminary declaration from one of the parties respecting condition, residence, affinity or consanguinity, and age ; minors in all cases to prove consent of parents or guardians.

2. Issue licences as at present, requiring consent for minors as above.

3. In place of either banns or licence,* allow twenty-one days' notice of all particulars, attested by a churchwarden or by two householders known to the clergyman, to be lodged with the incumbent of the parish in which each party resides, such notice to be entered in a book kept for the purpose, accessible within reasonable hours to anyone who desires to see it. In the absence of alleged impediment, let the clergyman issue a certificate of the fact, which, so far as concerns the party or parties resident in his own parish, shall have the effect of a licence. If the parties reside in different parishes, a certificate must be obtained from each clergyman.

4. Let the parties, furnished with certificate of banns, or with licence, or with certificate or certificates in lieu of banns or licence, be entitled to have such document or documents endorsed by the clergyman of the parish in which either one of them resides, and addressed by him to the clergyman of any parish within the rural deanery in the church of which parish they may desire to be married. [The area of the rural deanery is chosen as approximating to that of the union, over the whole of which the superintendent registrar's certificate or licence gives choice of their place of marriage to Nonconformists.]

5. Let the larger portion of the marriage fee, say three-fourths, be given to the clergyman signing the certificate, and only a small proportion be payable to the clergyman who officiates at the marriage.

6. Place fees on an uniform scale ; and where parties reside in different parishes, let only half the usual fee for banns or certificate be charged in each parish.

7. Let the penalties of perjury attach to all false declarations, whether made on oath or not, and let it be the duty of some public officer to take proceedings in such cases.

8. Let those clergy who through negligence or inadvertence marry persons without proper authority be punishable as for misdemeanour only, not, as under existing law, for felony.

9. Abolish Scotch irregular marriages, and fix an uniform limit

* See Report of Committee of the Lower House of Canterbury Convocation on Marriage by Banns, 1866. Suggestion vi.

of hours within which all marriages in all the three kingdoms must take place.

10. Abolish altogether the marriage of divorced persons in church in the lifetime of those to whom they have once been lawfully married. If the State thinks such unions right, let them take place in secular buildings, and in presence of civil officers. A clear distinction should however be maintained between divorce and nullity of marriage.

11. Adhere to the system of registration now used in England, and extend it to Scotland and Ireland.

MR. J. THEODORE DODD.

MARRIAGE is not merely a contract recognized by the State, and therefore only a civil contract, but it is a natural contract, having among Christians the sanction of religion, and hence it is a religious contract.*

Acts of Parliament can neither make nor unmake a marriage.

Consequently the law which *compels* the Church to allow her buildings and services to be used for the marriage of divorced persons, whom the Church has never declared to be unmarried, is an infringement of the rights of the Church, and ought to be repealed.

The Archbishop of Canterbury has clearly pointed out, in answer to a petition on this subject, that if churchmen want a thing *done* they must do it themselves, through their representatives in Parliament.†

I have spoken of marriage as a religious contract; but I am well aware that marriage before the registrar is a good and valid marriage, both according to the old canon law of the Christian Church, as well as in the eye of the State.

The old maxim was *consensus facit matrimonium*, and the intervention of a priest was not considered absolutely necessary according to the ancient canon law. See the judgment of Lord Stowell in *Dalrymple v. Dalrymple*, 2 Hag., Consist. 64. The Scotch law, which to this day requires, as a matter of necessity, neither the presence of any minister of religion, nor of any public officer, is here identical with the old canon law. It is said, however, that the presence of a priest, or since the Reformation, of a deacon, was

* The Report of the Royal Commissioners, published in 1868, contains much valuable information. A large number of witnesses were examined, and a circular letter, signed by Lord Chelmsford on behalf of the Commissioners, was addressed to all the bishops and a selection of the clergy of the United Kingdom, Protestant and Roman Catholic, as well as to certain ecclesiastical officers and other individuals suggested as likely to give important practical information on the subject of the inquiry. This is the report to which I refer several times, both in the text and notes.

† It is only fair to his Grace to add, that since the above was written, the bishops have announced their resolution *not* to grant licences for the marriage of divorced persons. (Note appended December 2nd, 1878.)

always necessary to a valid marriage in England.* Nevertheless, it is most desirable to induce all church people to marry in the church, first—that they may have the benefit of the Church's blessing, and secondly—because such a practice tends to strengthen the Church. I think, therefore, every obstacle in the way of Church marriages should be removed, or at least they should be made as easy as civil marriages. A civil marriage, inclusive of the notices, costs seven shillings. The cheapest method of marriage by banns costs, in most churches, 1s. 6d. or 2s. od. more than a civil marriage: often the cost is still greater. This should be reduced. Complaints were made as to the amount of fees for church marriages in England by Dean Hook (Report, p. 13), and the Bishop of Rochester (p. 14). Sir G. Clark stated that he believed the principal reason why many Northumberland people were irregularly married in Scotland was to avoid the expense of the marriage fees in their own parish churches (p. 132). Before leaving the subject of fees, I may remark that it would appear from the law books, notwithstanding the provisions of the rubrics, that a clergyman has *not* a right to refuse to marry because the fees are not paid.† Moreover, the fee must be a reasonable one. In an agricultural parish, ten shillings for the clergyman and three shillings for the clerk has been declared unreasonable.‡

In Scotland, the amount of the fees often deters persons from incurring the expense of a regular marriage, and so they are content with an irregular one, or none at all: so that a reduction is much needed there. There are three forms of "irregular" marriage in Scotland, viz.:—(1) *Per verba de presenti*. (2) Promise of marriage, with subsequent cohabitation. (3) Habit and repute.—See Report, pp. xviii., xxxi. The Act, 41 and 42 Vict., c. 43, has just been passed to encourage regular marriages in Scotland. It comes into operation on Jan. 1st, 1879. It enables ministers, clergymen, and priests to celebrate marriages on registrar's certificate; and enacts that any marriage so celebrated shall be deemed to be a regular marriage, as if it had been celebrated after banns. The entire cost of the registrar's certificate is 2s. 6d. The Act (sec. 12) contains a provision for punishing with a fine any person otherwise entitled to celebrate a marriage, who shall celebrate a marriage in Scotland *with a religious ceremony* unless the parties produce either certificates of due proclamation of banns or registrars' certificates. The Act will, I believe, cheapen regular marriage in Scotland.

Great complaints are also made by the Roman Catholics in England, of the expense caused by their being compelled to have a registrar present at their weddings, whose fees must be added to the offerings made to the priest. I think that both in the case of

* *R. v. Millis*, 10 C. and F. 534. *Beamish v. Beamish*, 9 H. L. Cas. 274. See *Catterall v. Catterall*, 1 Rob. Ecc: Rep. 580.

† *Cripps*, 699. See also *Lindwood*, Lib. v. tit. 2, p. 279. It would seem from *Escott v. Mastin*, 4 Moore, P.C.C. 104, that the court will construe rubrics according to the old law, where reasonably practicable.

‡ *Bryant v. Foote*, 3 L. R. Q. B. 497.

Romanists and Dissenters, the priest, or licensed minister, ought to be allowed to marry without the registrar, just as the clergy of the Established Church are allowed.

I would, in the next place, suggest that the hours during which marriages may be solemnized should be extended. Instead of from eight to twelve, they should be from eight to three o'clock. The old rule was probably made because the newly-married couple always received the Holy Communion: as this was done fasting, the breakfast always took place after the wedding.

Besides reduction of the *cost* and enlargement of the *time* of marriage, all difficulty about the *place* of marriage should be removed. In towns like Sheffield, where the old parish has been divided and sub-divided into many separate districts or parishes, the question is often asked, whether the marriage may take place in the old church, in cases where neither bride nor bridegroom reside within the district still attached to it, but do live in what *was* part of the original parish?

A feeling, perhaps a sentimental one, hangs round our old church. Our fathers and grandfathers married there, and their descendants would fain do the same. Many generations of our forefathers sleep there in hope of the resurrection, and this alone gives in our eyes a consecration to that spot which no other can acquire.

There is therefore often a strong desire expressed by persons in favour of their marriage taking place in the old parish church. Sometimes also people belonging to the congregation of some church other than that of the district in which they live, not unnaturally wish that the church, in which they worship habitually, should be the place where they take their life-long vows.

As the law stands now, both in *distinct* and *district* parishes constituted under the Acts passed in the 58th and 59th years of George III., the marriage *must* take place in the district Church, and *not* in the old parish church.* The same rule holds good for the consolidated chapelries.† In the case of new churches, built and constituted under the Ecclesiastical Commissioners' Acts, the question is more doubtful, as those Acts, like most of our ecclesiastical laws, are rather confused. It seems, however, that where the Commissioners have authorized marriages, and the incumbent of the new church is entitled to the whole of the fees, then the new church is the only place where the inhabitants of such districts may marry.‡

The Bishop's authorization of marriage has not the same effect as that of the Commissioners.§ Happily, no marriage can be invalidated by reason of non-residence;|| but in the case of minors marrying without consent of parents, non-residence may occasion a forfeiture of property.¶ The clergyman who knowingly marries

* Phillimore's Ecclesiastical Law, pp. 763, 767, 2181. Cripps, 678.

† Phillimore, 2182.

‡ 19 and 20 Vic., c. 104, ss. 14, 15.—(Lord Blandford's Act.) Phill., 2176.

§ Reg. v. Perry, 3 E. and E. 640, 6 and 7 Wm. IV., c. 85. Phill., 2177, 765.

|| 4 Geo. IV., c. 76, s. 26.

¶ Ibid: s. 23.

non-residents is liable to punishment, and it is his duty to make reasonable inquiry, according to the size and circumstances of his parish, as to whether the persons intending to marry are really residents. I should suggest, as an amendment of the law, that any two persons should be allowed to marry at any church within the county, or riding, after having had their banns put up at their respective district churches.

The rural deanery has been suggested as a better limit than the county. But lay-people do not, as a rule, know the boundaries of rural deaneries. The Poor-law Union would be preferable in the country, and perhaps the borough, in towns. Or persons might be allowed to marry within (say) ten miles from the district church where the banns of either of them were put up.

Another consequence which seems to flow from the fact that marriage is not a contract deriving its efficacy from the civil power is, that no failure to comply with the preliminaries to marriage which the State requires (such as banns or licence) ought to invalidate a marriage.

The law, unfortunately, is somewhat different; but the Royal Commissioners, in 1868, proposed to alter it, so that no failure, or fraud, with respect to banns, should invalidate the marriage of people, who have actually gone through the ceremony of marriage before an authorized minister of religion, or civil officer.

This will, I consider, be a great improvement. Of course, the people committing the fraud, or wilfully disobeying the law, ought to be punishable, and in some cases highly punishable; but that is very different from declaring people not married when they really are.

If a man or woman is married by banns under a false name, given fraudulently, and with the knowledge of the other party, such marriage is at present null and void. This was decided in the case of *Midgeley, falsely called Wood, v. Wood*.* There the wrong christian name had been given. In the Appendix to the Report, page 48, several cases on wrong names are cited. It should, however, be remembered that *R. v. the Inhabitants of Tibshelf*† was decided by Lord Tenterden, under 26 George II. c. 33, and not under 4 George IV. c. 76, the Act now in force‡ A marriage solemnized after an undue publication of banns will not be null and void under the provisions of the Marriage Act of 1823, unless it be shown that both parties "knowingly and wilfully" concurred in such undue publication.§

What would be the position of a Clergyman who was asked to re-marry a person who had repudiated his marriage on account of some error about banns, even though such error was known to the other party?

* 30 L. J., Mat. Cas. 57.

† 1 B. and Ad. 190.

‡ See Chitty's Statutes, vol. iii., p. 250. See also for cases, Fisher's Digest, 2340, 4362. *Templeton v. Tyree*, L. R. 2 P. and M. 420.

§ *Gompertz v. Kensit*, L. R. 13, Eq. 369.

Of course it may be said that every one knows the laws,* and that therefore the parties must have *known* that the whole marriage was a nullity.

I reply that the maxim certainly *ought* not to apply to ecclesiastical law, for it was stated by the Lord Chief Justice Cockburn that the Privy Council were *not* familiar with ecclesiastical law; and if such is the case with judges of known and tried learning in other branches of legal study, how can knowledge, with any fairness, be imputed to ignorant people of the poorer classes? The Commissioners in their Report† speak very seriously of the dangers which may result from the application of this maxim to the marriage law.

Another consequence which follows from the view that marriage is not merely a civil contract is, that it is essentially the same in every country.

It is therefore irrational, as well as inconvenient, that the marriage laws should be different in England, Scotland, and Ireland.

The Royal Commissioners on the marriage law strongly advise that the law of the three countries, England, Scotland, and Ireland, should be rendered uniform;‡ and I quite agree with them, that such a course would be most beneficial, if practicable.

In the case of Ireland the difficulty would not be great, as England has long taken upon itself to arrange the matrimonial affairs of the Irish, in about as complicated and unreasonable a manner as could well be conceived; and any change would be for the better.

But in Scotland the case is different.

Here, we have no conquered country subject to uncongenial laws, but we have a land which, with a deadly hate of all that savours of Rome in the way of dogma or ritual, is most deeply imbued with the law by which Rome has in fact ruled most of the nations of Europe, centuries after her legions have been vanquished.

And just as the civil law influences Scotland, so does the canon law.§ The English marriage law is also to some extent founded upon the canon law; and of course, as the great majority of Irish are Roman Catholics, they would readily accept any alterations from the old canon law; although it differs considerably from the modern canon law now enforced by the Papacy.

I think, therefore, our best chance of obtaining uniformity is to

* As to the real meaning of this maxim, see R. v. Tewkesbury, L. R. 3 Q. B. 629.

† Pp. x., xix.

‡ Report, p. xxiv.

§ For some interesting remarks on the general influence of the Canon Law, see Maine's *Ancient Law*, p. 286, and the *Early History of Institutions*, by the same writer, p. 213. In the latter work (p. 62), Sir Henry Maine speaks of the origin of the Canon Law as an interesting and yet unsettled problem. He adds, "The truth seems to be that the Imperial Roman Law did not satisfy the morality of the Christian communities, and this is the most probable reason why another body of rules grew up by its side and ultimately almost rivalled it." For an account of its influence in England against conditions in restraint of marriage, see judgment of Lord Thurlow in *Scott v. Tyler*, 2 Dick., 716. The influence of the canon law in Scotland is much greater than in England.

return, as far as we reasonably can, to the common original. Of course no one proposes to return to the absurd prohibitions of certain marriages, which the canon law contained, and which it sometimes increased, and sometimes relaxed.

It is, however, only fair to say that its greatest folly, the prohibition of marriage between god-parents and god-children, and their respective relations, was in truth not an invention of its own, but borrowed from the primitive Roman law forbidding the marriage of Guardian and Ward;* for by Roman, and, indeed, by Aryan or Indo-Germanic law, adoption really made the person adopted a son or daughter,† as far as a legal "fiction" could do.

Through the judicial fairness and learning of the Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, the works of the great ecclesiastical lawyers Ayliffe and Gibson are being restored to their rightful place, and I trust the marriage laws, like all branches of Church Law, will feel the influence of the revival of the learning of the canon law. To the names I have mentioned, we would gladly add Lyndwood, Johnson, and others. Our own more modern ecclesiastical lawyers have tried in vain to grope their way. The result has been, often uncertainty and inconsistency in judicial decisions; sometimes, it may be, a failure of English justice towards an individual clergyman. I refer especially to the case of one who is now no longer living. His was not a case of any excess in ritual. He was suspended for simply doing what he believed to be his duty.

We must remember that the canon law of England is part of the law of England as well as the common law and statute law, and as such deserves the respect of every Englishman.‡ The view of the ancient canon law and the present Scotch law is, that marriage depends on the consent and intention§ of the parties, and that it depends no more on Acts of Parliament than birth or baptism. A child is baptized, though registration is omitted; and we cannot doubt that a person is born, and continues to be so, although his careless parents have illegally omitted to notify the happy event to the Registrar-General. It is, therefore, the wisdom of the civil power to make the requirements to legal marriage as easy and simple as possible; otherwise the Scotch will never

* Maine's *Early History of Institutions*, p. 239.

† Maine's *Ancient Law*, p. 131. *History of Institutions*, p. 231.

‡ The whole *foreign* canon law does not form part of the law of England. And, of course, both the Anglo-canon law and the common law have been, in many respects, altered by Statute. The Anglo-canon law consists of portions of the *general* canon law, and of provincial constitutions, and canons passed by the clergy and confirmed by the Crown in Convocation. As Justice Whitlock observed in *Evans v. Owen*, *Godbolt's Reports*, 432: "There is a common law ecclesiastical as well as our common law." See also judgment of Lord Justice James, in *Niboyet v. Niboyet*. (*Times*, November 19th, 1878.)

§ As to *intention* being necessary to irregular marriage in Scotch law, see *Steuart v. Robinson*, L. R. 2 H. L. C. 534, and the Report of the Commissioners, pp. xx., xxi. As to the English law, see the remarks of Sir R. Phillimore in *Sottomayor v. De Barros*, 2 P. and D. 86. His judgment was reversed on another point—3 P. and D. 1.

cordially agree to it. And if the requirements of the law are so simple and easy, it is a very strong presumption, almost overwhelming, in all ordinary cases, that those who neglect them did not intend marriage. I should, therefore, recommend that marriage should be made cheaper, and the law simplified, so as to render it more consonant to common sense; and as common sense in England, Scotland, and Ireland is much the same, the natural result will be that the Marriage Laws of the three countries will be rendered more uniform.

ADDRESSES.

THE DEAN OF MANCHESTER.

I do not appear before you spontaneously on this occasion. I was invited by the committee of the Congress to speak on this subject, I suppose, mainly because they thought it would keep me out of mischief on other subjects. I have had the pleasure of reading through my friend Mr. Temple's paper, and he has gone to a great degree in the line I myself should have done, but much more ably and more clearly. But there are some little points I should like to mention, though I do not think I shall be able to take up the whole time allotted to me. Marriage is a matter in which the Church is interested; I need hardly say so before an assembly of churchmen and women outside London. In London clubs, and amongst that literary society which takes the lead in public questions now, apparently, I have been challenged with the remark—"Whatever has the Church to do with marriage? Why can't you let it alone? What can it matter to you?" I think, in answering that question, I must say we judge of this by a different rule from that which the statesman alone would apply. I hope that the Church will have something to do with it. I hope that marriage will always be maintained—as no doubt it always will—as a religious ceremony; that is to say, as a contract receiving God's blessing. What constitutes the contract before the blessing is given, may be a questions for civilians and for churchmen to debate together and settle. You have different laws of contracts for enabling marriages to be performed in England, in Scotland, and Ireland. I was looking up a little while ago, that celebrated case—a scandalous case—called the *Yelverton* case; and for the reason that I recollect there was an article on that horrible case which stated that parties could be married in Ireland and their marriage not hold good in England or Scotland, and that parties might be married in Scotland, and their marriage not hold in Ireland and England; and I do not know whether a marriage which takes place according to English law would be recognised in either of the two other countries. But it is the most singular state of things, that two islands should have three different laws of marriage, and that there should be a possibility of this sort of statement being put forward in one of our leading newspapers and not challenged, as far as I know. Of course, I cannot speak to you as a lawyer, but still I think that the fact of a statement of that kind having been made and not challenged, shows that probably it was correct. Now, then, I think there ought to be one general mode of contracting marriage before the religious ceremony is performed; and I rather incline to the view which Mr. Temple has put forward about the adopting something equivalent to the French plan. But if you talk about the *Code Napoleon* or the French methods to many English people, they fly

off at once, and cannot get themselves to conform to them. That was the case, I believe, in the diocese of Lichfield in one of their conferences, when the report of the committee, which I hold in my hand, was brought up. The fifth recommendation of that committee runs as follows:—"There is another course which the committee are not prepared to recommend off-hand,"—they are very cautious—"but which, they think" deserves the consideration of the Conference; that is, the assimilation of our English law of marriage to that of the *Code Napoleon* in France, by which all marriages are entered into before the civil magistrate, and the civil ceremony makes the marriage in the eye of the state complete. The utmost vigilance is enjoined, the strictest precaution taken, so that it is in evidence that bigamous or incestuous marriages are extremely rare in France. It is not intended that the parties should rest content with the civil ceremony. On the contrary, every facility is given for the interposition of the sacred office. The certificate of the secular union is granted expressly, *pour servir, aux ceremonies religieuses*, and it issues without charge when the parties are poor. The consequence is, that in at least ninety-five out of every hundred cases in France, the parties who contract before the civil officer, ask and afterwards receive the Church's blessing. At the same time, the clergy are not bound to officiate; when any canonical impediment appears, the minister of religion withholds his rite; and three publications of banns usually precede the religious ceremony." I am speaking in the presence of a member of the Lichfield Conference, but I understood that this report was referred back to the committee, very much on account of the *Code Napoleon* having been mentioned as a model for us. There may have been other reasons. Now there are several difficulties which we meet with in carrying out the intentions of the Church and the Legislature. I think it is a great shame that church people have not the same rights or equal privileges with Dissenters in this matter. The Registrar's certificate enables persons—I was going to say "parties," and I believe "parties" is a legal word in this particular case, though I recollect that Lord Beaconsfield, when in the House of Commons, in using the word "persons," instead of "parties," as he said he supposed the honourable member for Birmingham would call them. However, "parties," I believe, is a very good word, is it not?

MR. J. THEODORE DODD.

Oh! a very good word.

THE DEAN OF MANCHESTER.

Yes; but is it a legal word?

MR. J. THEODORE DODD.

It is a very proper word.

THE DEAN OF MANCHESTER.

WHY should not a certificate of publication of banns be granted, enabling any Church parties to be married in any church in the rural deanery? The committee of Lichfield go on to say that they think that the limitation of the marriage to the church of the parish at which one or other of the parties reside, might safely be extended, and the area considerably enlarged. The registrar's certificate may be obtained from any chapel within the registrar's district in which marriage may be solemnised, but it can only be issued from the church in which the persons can be married.* It would be found in the long run that each clergyman would get a fair proportion of marriages; while the complaint now is—and a very serious complaint—at any rate in Lancashire, and, I believe, in the West-Riding—that a man

* I have since been told that the registrar's certificate is often issued for marriage in any Church within his district.

contracting marriage among the working classes is expected to entertain a large number of persons, and is often very severely mulcted by his fellow-workmen at the time; and, of course, is looked upon as a very stingy fellow if he will not do this. I think that is a very disagreeable thing, and I have known of persons coming in their working dress, and going out at different doors of the church and back to work, in order that the fact of marriage may not be known to their fellow-workmen, and so they may escape the penalty which their companions put upon them. I think that is a very serious matter, that you can only escape all this by going to the registrar. Surely Church people who wish to be married in church should be entitled to the same advantages. Further, I think licences ought to be made cheaper. Why should a person married by licence, when the case is quite clear, be obliged to pay a large sum? This is a distinction between poor and rich, of which I say, "the sooner it is abolished the better." Why should not licences be made cheaper, when the heavy charge is put on to make a fee for the chancellor and the registrar of the diocese, an income for which, in fact, they very often do nothing. The Lichfield committee recommended that cheap licences should be issued in England—that while the publication of banns should not be abolished, the bishop's officer should be the person to whom notice of banns should be given, and on whom the responsibility of verifying should rest. You have heard from Mr. Temple how difficult it is for the clergy to verify what is stated to them. A short time ago a complaint reached me from a clergyman in Cheshire, that a man had come over to Manchester and married his deceased wife's sister at the Cathedral. He said, "This has been a very serious thing to me, because I have resolutely opposed the thing here, and the people all know it, and it will appear that I was imposing upon them a disability which the Church and State did not impose." It was quite true. They had gone to the Manchester Cathedral, and had been married by licence; and you know the officer grants his licence upon a sworn deposition. They said there was no legal impediment, and their marriage took place; and certainly it was a disgraceful thing: but who was to prosecute? Could I require the clergymen who performed these offices in the cathedral to do that, when a licence had been brought from the registrar, signed by the bishop's chancellor? Surely the clergyman is not the person on whom that duty of prosecuting should fall. One of the recommendations which I think Mr. Temple mentioned, is a very good one indeed—that persons applying for banns or licences should produce a certificate, signed by a churchwarden, or two respectable householders, who would vouch for the truth of the case. That would impose a very small difficulty on most persons, and then I think the clergyman ought to be relieved. Now I come to the last point. You have had already before you that provision of the Divorce Act which enables guilty parties to re-marry in the lifetime of their former partners. I think this is a scandalous action on the part of the State, sanctioning that which, at any rate, a very large number of students of the Bible think is absolutely forbidden by God's law. And, mind you, it is a different thing from another question that follows it. It does not depend upon the Jewish law. It depends upon the words of our blessed Lord and Saviour. Now that Act, although I believe it was a very bad one for the State to pass, has afforded us a stand-point for showing that the laws of the Church and the laws of the State may be at variance, and that that variance is recognised by the State. The State in this very Divorce Act contemplates a difficulty on the part of the clergy in complying with it, because it may be contrary to the law of the Church—and provides a very insufficient remedy. It, however, acknowledges that there may be a higher law governing the conduct of the clergy in this matter, and makes an inadequate provision to meet it. I think we ought to get this provision of the Act repealed. There was a case some time ago which attracted a great deal of attention in London, wherein at a leading church an adulteress was married. I

am afraid I should be correct in stating that within a short time she left the second man who was called her husband. What a disgrace it was that the blessing of the Church should have been given to such a union as that. How can we expect the sanctity of the marriage-tie to be regarded as it ought to be, if such things as these are allowed? And that ceremony was performed with the bishop's licence. To be sure, the bishop personally does not give the licence. It comes through the officers; but those officers must be considered officers of a spiritual court, and it looks as if the Church itself, by its highest authority, had given sanction to that which the State itself acknowledges may be regarded by conscientious clergymen as contrary to the law of God. I think we ought to exert ourselves to get the law repealed, in order to show that there is, as I hope there always will be, consent between the law of the realm and the law of God, and that we wish to preserve this agreement, as far as we Churchmen are concerned.

REV. G. SANDFORD, Sheffield.

I HAVE much pleasure in being privileged to speak at this Congress on a subject so closely connected with the moral and religious well-being of the community as the marriage law, although I am restricted to a single section of it,—the claim of the incumbent of the mother church to marry all comers from every part of the original parish, or rather the claim of all members of the original parish, now divided into many distinct parts, to be married at the mother church. I do not wonder that the paramount claim of the incumbents of the mother church should be embraced and maintained by many, while the original title, such as the vicar of Halifax, or Leeds, or Sheffield remains, and when the church of the reduced parish is familiarly called the parish church, as though by way of distinction, while there are thirty parishes near at hand, equally independent; nor do I wonder at the attachment borne by churchmen, inhabitants of a parish once entire and undivided, to the mother church, interwoven through past generations with their family histories, their ancestors being baptised and married within its walls. And I am quite willing also to admit, that the high character, and genial qualities of many of the vicars of our mother parishes, have secured great popularity and affection, and extended their influence in their respective neighbourhoods. But I have nothing now to do with sentiment. I appeal to the paramount authority of the law of the land, and wish to refer to the Peel Act, the Blandford Act, the Clergyman's Legal Handbook by Dale, the Laws of the Clergy by Cripps, and the Decision of the Court at Westminster in the friendly suit between the late vicar of Sheffield, Dr. Sale, and the local clergy about the fees of the Sheffield General Cemetery. Moreover I will advance a step further, and say, that the exclusive privilege of marrying the members of their charge is not limited to incumbents of parishes. I have the high authority of Mr. Cripps, in his Laws of the Clergy, p. 678, for saying that if both parties live in a district in which marriages are solemnized, they must be married there, and not in the *old* parish church; though doubtless if there be offshoots from parishes formed by the Peel and Blandford Acts, these, and not the so-called original parish will stand in the relation of the mother parish to them. I may also appeal to some of the present company for bearing me out in the assertion, that letters from the ecclesiastical commissioners, and from Lord Blandford, now Duke of Marlborough, have declared the perfectly independent position of the incumbents of the parishes formed by the Peel and Blandford Acts, and the new parishes to be as distinct ecclesiastically from the old as though they had never been previously united. I

beg also to refer to a circumstance connected with the ecclesiastical history of Sheffield. The late Dr. Sale claimed from the Sheffield General Cemetery Company all the fees payable by way of compensation in Sheffield to the clergyman of the parish from which a deceased person had been removed, and it was decided about twelve years ago that the clergymen of the parishes constituted by the Peel and Blandford Acts were entitled to their several fees, as representatives of independent parishes, though they had never possessed a consecrated churchyard or a particle of ground for it. I entertain the utmost respect for all clergymen who have endeavoured scrupulously to discharge their duty in this vexed question, though I cannot help thinking that some of them, who have levied double fees for funerals from new parishes as extra-parochial, and have married inhabitants of the same new parishes as their own parishioners, have had but little regard for the letter, or spirit of the law. I am quite satisfied with what I believe to be the law, if only it were fully administered, and I believe the inhabitants of the new parishes to be ecclesiastically inhabitants of them, and of no other.

The Right Rev. Bishop RYAN.

I SHALL try, in the few remarks I make to you, to deepen somewhat the impression already made on many minds, that an intense necessity exists for some revision of the marriage laws. Mr. Temple has spoken about the United Kingdom. I have had experience, very painful indeed, as affecting the Church outside the borders of the United Kingdom. I was vicar of the Isle of Alderney, and the people used to come from France to be married. There was one couple I wanted very much to get rid of; but I was compelled to marry them. On another occasion a woman, whom I believed to have a husband living, went to Jersey, was checked there, then proceeded to Weymouth, and came back married to a man from Alderney. And with reference to our colonies, I am sure that there are some present—some bishops—who can tell you about the great difficulty that arises in that way. In the island of Mauritius the *Code Napoleon* works very awkwardly indeed sometimes. A soldier came to me to be married once, and when I asked him for the leave of the colonel he produced it to me, and also the certificate of the publication of the banns; but he had not got the commissary's signature; and when I explained to him that for want of that he could not be married according to French law, he was very much astonished, and asked:—"Did we not conquer the island from the French?" And he was ready to conquer the island again, if necessary; but subjection to French law puzzled him. In one other instance the Church of Rome was affected. There was a man who gave in his own name and the name of the lady he was going to marry, and everything was arranged. The marriage was performed, but the notice had been taken down after the first publication. The consequence was that he lived with the lady for some time, took away all her property, and then went away, and insisted on being legally married to another person. Of course that did not affect us so much; but we shall want the attention of the legislature to Crown colonies, like Mauritius, to endeavour to remove such anomalies as these, which press most fearfully upon the consciences of those who minister in the Church of England in those places. I went to Bradford, thinking,—"Well, now it will be all peace in that respect." Instead of that I found a very great deal of difficulty with reference to some things Canon Temple has mentioned. I was very thankful to hear the conclusion arrived at about cheap licences. If you could induce the people of new districts to look upon the Church as being their Church, to look upon the clergy as being their clergy, it would be well. But it is simply

impossible to uproot feelings which have grown upon people for years, especially when it is in places where they can quote the precedents of their fathers and grandfathers. In many cases, if you won't have the people, and you send them away, they go and live without marriage. I am now speaking in the presence of the rural dean of Bradford, and he told me that this strictness only led people to the registrar's office, and had not at all increased the marriages in his church. These are difficulties with which we have to deal; and I do hope and trust that the attention of the legislature will be very seriously directed to what is a very serious matter indeed for us who have to administer the law in those large towns. My own conclusion was just that we want cheaper licences, that we want the incumbent in each parish to be satisfied about the genuineness of the matter, and then that he should give them the licence. I would rather have it that they should be married in the churches of the rural deanery than in the churches of the county. However, these are all matters of detail. But as to the fact that the marriage laws, as they now exist, do affect the Church most painfully; I trust one result of the Congress will be to impress that fact upon the minds of the people and upon the legislature.

DISCUSSION.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE, M.P.

YOUR attention has been secured by the addresses, marked by great ability and clearness, which might induce some persons to look with favour on that provision of the *Code Napoleon*, — the compulsion of a universal civil marriage preceding the religious ceremony. There is no doubt a fascination in the apparent symmetry of such a provision; but it is one thing as a theory, and as a practice another. It may be admirable theoretically; the practical result would be that the poor and the uneducated classes would look upon the measure as a reason—if not as a prohibitory order, a prohibition—forbidding them to go to church. We know that compulsory registration has made the clergyman's work more difficult in bringing children to baptism; but there are civil necessities, I believe, which compel legislation. I see no civil necessity which compels a uniform civil marriage, when the religious ceremony, in a place of worship, can be so regulated as to secure the record of law which the State is bound to demand morally. The marriage law must, no doubt, be regulated: but on this head I have a warning to offer: well knowing that I may be near touching on a point which may be delicate, I am not going into the kernel of the matter, but I cannot overlook the great difficulty in legislating on the marriage question. There have been already fragmentary attempts at legislation; but unfortunately those fragmentary attempts have dealt with only one page of the Prayer-book, and have greatly startled quiet people, and indisposed them from risking any change. It is the page containing a list of a good many of our nearest and dearest relations. People are most reasonably very much afraid of raising the marriage question, for fear that particular page should again come into discussion. Now as to that page, I desire that there shall be no ambiguity. We have one table of prohibited degrees for England. On the whole continent of Christian Western Europe—excluding, that is, Russia, Greece, and the Danubian States, which enter into the Eastern Church more or less,—there is another table of prohibited degrees. I am convinced, and I tell you so with all solemnity, that there is no chance of stepping between those two tables. Those people who try to wriggle betwixt and between, and who profess to give you a sample of pure British brandy in their amended table of degree, doctored to suit

British taste and British morality, will only lead you into a quagmire. The foreign table of prohibited degrees, in about every country of Western Europe except Great Britain, allows a man, with or without dispensation, to marry his brother's widow, as well as the other form of sister-in-law: it allows a man to marry his wife's niece and a woman her husband's nephew, and it allows him to marry his blood niece and blood aunt, and her to marry her blood nephew and blood uncle. In France, under the original *Code Napoleon*, these alliances were not permitted. But one of the earliest acts of Louis Philippe's Government was to legalise them, with the illusory safeguard of a royal dispensation, which is of course now the dispensation of Marshal MacMahon. The Frenchman is now allowed to marry his "*belle-sœur*," and the Frenchwoman her "*beau-frère*," as they are allowed to marry their aunt and their niece, uncle and nephew, by the dispensation of the sovereign power. I talk in French of "*beau-frère*" and "*belle-sœur*," not out of affectation, but because they are the terms used in the French law,—which absolutely ignores the frivolous distinction between wife's sister and brother's wife. Each is regarded as sister-in-law, and each is called so. The German law is equally ignorant of the distinction. In Roman Catholic countries the Papal dispensation has to come in, to validate such unions. In Protestant Holland, sister-in-law, aunt, and niece are allowable, I think, without dispensation. In some countries of Protestant Germany, some form of secular dispensation is required—with about as much difficulty about it as a licence at home; in others even this is not necessary. We know very well how the royal families of Spain and Portugal have abused the sorry privilege. We were all a little interested in the Carlist war, and all more or less realised that Don Carlos was the descendant of that former Don Carlos who troubled Queen Isabella's childish years. The new Don Carlos is the grandson of the earlier one, and he had two wives. Those two wives were sisters of each other (Princesses of Portugal), and both of them nieces to their husband. For both marriages the papal dispensation was ready. I will not dwell on this matter further; but the marriage law is a question which has not merely to be discussed by Royal Commissions, at Church Congresses, or in Diocesan conferences, but in a more authoritative place. It would be well, in order to clear your mind for the future definition of the subject, to make yourself well aware that, any pretences or assertions or asseverations by lawyers and interested widowers notwithstanding, there is in the common sense of Europe, and there will be in the common sense of this island when it seriously faces the problem, one rule of strictness and another rule of laxity, which makes no degree impossible for the marriage bond, except direct descent and the one immediate relation of brother and sister. Strictness is still our birthright; while the only women whom the Western European is forbidden to touch, are parent and child in their several descents and his father or his mother's daughter. You cannot steer the middle way between the two. That is a fact upon which I believe the public mind requires to be informed; but naturally persons who dread alterations do not like to handle publicly so painful and disagreeable a topic. The nature of the danger makes the watchmen dumb. They fear seeming prurient, when they are only stating facts of actual law and contemporary life; and in their cowardice they leave the field open to those whose intent is to darken council and deny inevitable results. But truth is truth; facts are facts. I give you those facts: go home and ponder them.

REV. FRANCIS PIGOU, D.D., Vicar of Halifax.

I HAVE heard myself more than once quoted in the course of this debate, and there is probably no clergyman in England—I do not even yield to the Vicar of Bradford and the Vicar of Leeds—who can be more profoundly affected by this question than I. It has been very rightly said that the ancient parish of Halifax, of which I am rural dean, is equal to Rutlandshire in size, and I found, when I was appointed to Halifax, that this question affecting marriages was, amongst the clergy in my deanery, what we may really call a “burning question.” Now there has been no one, I think I may say with truth, who has been more jealous of the parochial rights of the clergy of my deanery than I have been myself, or than I have sought to be. I have thoroughly realised their difficulties, but I have also felt that there probably was no clergyman in that deanery who, had he been placed in my position, would not have acted in very much the same way. But finding the difficulty that existed, I said to the clergy in my deanery, when we met together, “I can appreciate your difficulties and the position you take in this matter,” and I sacrificed a part of my income—I do not believe I could have been compelled to do it—which would have enabled me to have an additional curate for my large parish; I willingly surrendered this to the clergy, and my rule is to remit to them in their different parishes the fees which would have been theirs had the marriages taken place in their own parishes. I think Canon Temple is not quite correct in saying they are not satisfied. There are very many in the deanery, and I think three-fourths of the clergy are satisfied with the arrangement. My own earnest conviction is that which was stated to you by Bishop Ryan; we may hold our theories about the parochial rights of clergy—that have been separated from the mother church, but—I do not know whether I am accurate in saying so or not—I have always understood that this dictum was laid down by Lord Cairns, that “parishioners, by the subdivision of a large parish into smaller parishes, acquire new rights but do not part with their old ones.” Now, if that dictum be true, it seems to me to set the question practically at rest; and the persons living outside the limits now of the old parish church of Halifax can, if they please, assert their right to be married in the mother church. My own conviction is, I know, shared by the Vicar of Leeds on this subject. We should be very glad if some law could be passed, and I do not think any of us see our way out of it except in that way; for this reason, that we may theorise about it as much as we please, but that after three years’ experience in Halifax, and three years’ residence amongst some of the most independent people you could possibly meet, I am quite certain that if I, in my position there, were to take any steps to prevent persons being married at the parish church, I should stir up far more strife than was stirred up about the vicars’ rate—certainly as much—and I am sure they would not go to be married at any other church: they would go to the registrar’s office, and be married without the Church’s blessing. I have taken great pains to enquire into that subject; I have done it in the interests of my brethren of the deanery; and I hear but one opinion: that if they were, by any act of my own, to be deterred from coming to the parish church, they would not go to the churches where they respectively live. Therefore, I say, do you believe that anyone, occupying the positions we do, as vicars of these large towns, would knowingly and willingly take a course that would be likely to alienate a large number of persons from the Church, and send them to the registry office? I do not think they would. And then again we must remember I do not speak only of the strong ties that exist between the people and the parish church; I say it would take a long time to educate the people to go and be married in the

other churches. I would even put an additional fee upon the marriage at the parish church, so as, if possible, to drive the people to their own respective churches; but they won't do it; they will still come to us; and I think I will ask any of my brother clergymen in this room what he would do in my place—whether he would run the risk of sending the people to registry offices to be married? We had a meeting, under the auspices of the Vicar of Leeds, on this subject. We were only anxious to do what we could to bring it about in a way that should not uproot what we felt to be the traditions and sentiments of a large class of people who live around us. I believe, myself, with the Vicar of Leeds, that the thing we should most agitate is not so much cheap marriages, for I never yet heard that made as a complaint, but for the same liberty to be given to the people in the Church of England, to be married where they please, as is given to the Nonconformists; and if we could bring about a law of that kind, and try not to get angry upon a subject such as this, and give each other credit for doing what we can, I think that, on the whole, that would be perhaps the most practical solution of this most difficult question.

REV. MAYOW W. MAYOW, Rector of Halstead, Kent.

I WAS uncertain what special course this debate might take; but the particular point to which I wish to speak, is that which has been touched upon by Mr. Beresford Hope, viz., that I trust, whatever may be done in removing difficulties, or making more consistent marriage laws, there will be no attempt to tamper with the table of prohibited degrees. Many persons seem disposed to give up the scriptural arguments against certain marriages (as that with deceased wife's sister); but I am persuaded that the argument from scripture is perfectly tenable and valid, just as set down in our table of degrees, and 99th canon. And there is, I suppose, no room for reasonable doubt, that the case of the advocates for a change in our law, which may sanction the marriage of a man with a deceased wife's sister, rests mainly, so far as the scriptural argument is concerned, upon the 18th verse of the 18th chapter of Leviticus, that a man "shall not take a wife to her sister, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, beside the other in her life-time;" the inference being that if such a union is forbidden in the life-time of the first wife, there is a tacit sanction of the same after her decease. If it were not for this one verse, thus translated and thus interpreted, there would, I think, hardly be a question raised or a doubt felt, by one in a thousand, that such unions are prohibited, denounced as incestuous, and forbidden under God's general law, just as we find them set down in Archbishop Parker's table of prohibited degrees. But is there no other account to be given of this 18th verse of the eighteenth Leviticus? I think assuredly there is, and that it will be found in what is called the law of the Levirate, laid down in the twenty-fifth chapter of the book of Deuteronomy, referred to by our Lord in the New Testament, in his arguments with the Sadducees as to the Resurrection, that if a man dies childless, his brother shall take the wife and raise up seed to his brother. But now, suppose two brothers marry two sisters C and D. If A, the first brother, dies, the second brother would be enjoined to take his wife and raise up seed to his brother; but if his own wife were still alive, according to the 18th verse, this would not be permitted; and this, we are told, is precisely the Jewish reading of it. Dr. McCaul, the late very learned Hebrew scholar, who advocated the permission to marry the deceased wife's sister, gives this restriction in its fullness, and finds it precisely and definitely upon that text in Leviticus. The forbidding of it was because the man was not to take two wives, sisters, his first wife being alive, *i.e.*, "beside

the other in her life-time." If his wife had not been the sister of the wife of the brother, he would have been required by the law to take the widow to raise up seed to his brother. But Dr. McCaul says it is forbidden of him to do so, by this very verse, if the two wives be sisters and both alive, which therefore is a prohibition unto relaxation; and as this is the natural sense of that verse, Leviticus xviii. 18, so is it its sufficient sense, without the involving any contradiction to the general rule as to nearness of kindred between a man and his deceased wife's sister. If his own wife, being the sister of his deceased brother, were dead first, he would be enjoined to take her, as an exception to the general rule, under the laws of the Levirate; but if she, his wife, were still alive, that very verse would be a prohibition, and the law of the Levirate in that particular case would be suspended, and not complied with. Now if this be so, (and, I must maintain, it gives a full and sufficient sense and interpretation to that verse,) then the whole argument of those who rest upon it as the scriptural ground for the sanction of a man's marrying his deceased wife's sister is done away with; there is in it no reference to the general law at all, which remains as laid down in the 16th verse of the same chapter; and unless we conceive the whole law of the Levirate to be revived and in force, the 18th verse has no application at all to the matter in question. If that Leviratical law *were* a part of Christianity, a sanction would be given in one particular exceptional case for the marriage of a man with a deceased brother's wife. But this would be restricted if the brother's widow were his own wife's sister, his own wife being still alive, and not then be permitted. And if (as I have argued) this be the true cause and true sense of that 18th verse, then the general law remains, touching nearness of kindred, and the deceased wife's sister is included under its prohibition, just as the Church of England, in her canon and her prayer book, declares. One thing more let me say. If the legislature of this country should ever come to pass such an unhappy Act of Parliament as would interfere with our table of marriages in this way, I think it is absolutely necessary that the parties so intermarrying, contrary to the law of the Church, which our 99th canon declares to be incestuous and unlawful, should be excommunicated. It ought to be absolutely imperative that those making the breach in the law of the Church should be excommunicated everywhere, that the Church may bear her witness that the legislature has gone beyond its Christian power in tampering with our prohibited degrees at all. And I will venture to say this: that if any clergyman should refuse the holy communion to such persons as have thus broken the law of the Church, and were to be made subject to any penalty for doing so, this would be a thing tending so absolutely to the disruption of the establishment, that I believe in one year it would have more effect in that direction than all the labours and efforts of the Liberation Society in a hundred years.

Rev. T. OUTRAM MARSHALL, Organising Secretary of the
English Church Union.

THERE have been one or two suggestions thrown out to-night with regard to the grievances which we, as churchmen, feel. I believe we can easily remove all those grievances, if we set ourselves to do so resolutely and in a business-like way. Canon Temple thought that there was a certain grievance with regard to the higher fees charged in some parishes, than those charged for civil marriage. It is quite within the power of clergymen to do away with this grievance altogether. I think we ought to dismiss as unworthy of consideration what I can only call the commercial aspect of the question. We might easily decide to hand a bag to the

bride and bridegroom, and the rest of the bridal party, and let them give what they please. I was pained to hear so much about the commercial side of the question, as between the old parish church and the district churches. I think, however, if people must look at this question from a commercial point of view, that it would *pay* to make a collection at the weddings as well as on other occasions. I believe that if we appealed to people to give according to their sense of the blessing they had received, a great many would give liberally, and the Church would be benefited. It is certainly a grievance that Church people cannot be married elsewhere than in the church of a district wherein they reside, while Dissenters can be married in any one of their places of worship within the union. Our divisions result in this: that in some parishes there is much more reverence and solemnity in the performance of the services than in others; and it may be that those of us who are rich, when we are going to be married, can easily arrange to go and stay in a parish where the service will be in accordance with our ideas of reverence. But I have known cases of servants and poor artisans, who have felt quite as strongly as I should feel myself an earnest desire for a reverent performance of the marriage service, and above all, that it might be accompanied as the Prayer-book clearly recommends, by a celebration of Holy Communion, and to persons in this class of life it has been a great difficulty to go twenty miles to a parish where they could obtain, what I venture to say, they have a right to demand. Now, I believe that Parliament will give us churchmen this liberty, if we show ourselves liberal in another direction. I consider that our Roman Catholic and Nonconforming brethren have a real grievance on their side, in the fact that they are required to have a civil registrar present at their marriage service; while we church people are not so required. Well, if we will show ourselves ready and forward to remove this invidious distinction, by asking Parliament to impose the necessity of a registrar's certificate before all marriages, whether in the Church of England or in the Roman Catholic chapels, or in Dissenting chapels, and to provide that when the certificate has been given the registrar's presence shall be no longer necessary, then I think we may fairly expect that Parliament will be disposed to extend to us the liberty which we ask for, viz., that having got the registrar's certificate we may be married at any church within the rural deanery, or the diocese. Another grievance which is far more serious has been referred to several times,—I mean the use of the marriage service in our churches over divorced persons whose real husbands and wives are still alive; and I am thankful to find that this meeting has shown pretty clearly what its feeling on the subject is. It is nothing less than a scandal that in a land which professes to have an open Bible, the law of England should be so contrary to the law of God's word and God's Church. The law of the land is certainly not the same as the law of the Church on the marriage question, and therefore it is, to say the least, quite possible that it may not be so on ritual questions either. It appears that in the year 1857, when the Divorce Act was passed, this concession was made, that clergymen who felt conscientious scruples should not be compelled to marry divorced people. The remedy then for our present grievance is very simple. Why did the State make this concession? Simply because it knew that there were a certain number of determined clergymen who would go to prison or to death rather than violate their consciences and the law of God. But the Church has only got to show that as a Church she has a conscience, and that she is quite as determined to obey the voice of her conscience as some of her priests are. With regard to our clergy, let the Church of England in her convocations lay down this,—that if any clergyman perform the marriage service over a person who has been divorced, the wife or the husband, in either case not being dead, he shall be suspended from the ministry. It is for our Church to make rules for her own body; let the nation make what rules it will for itself. If the majority of the nation be outside the Church, let them

make and observe what laws they will. We claim, of course, our right, as English citizens, as voting for our representatives in Parliament, to try and keep the law of the land in unison with the law of God and his Church; but if we fail, then we appeal to our right reverend fathers and the reverend the clergy in Convocation, to speak in the name of the Church, and say, as a Church, "We will keep our own law unaltered." I am glad to see that 100 bishops, the other day at the Lambeth Conference, practically said this. A report was read and adopted by all the bishops, which set forth that the committee, while fully recognising the difficulties in which various branches of the Church had been placed by the action of local legislatures—such as the English Parliament or the Natal Government—were of opinion that steps should be taken by each branch of the Church to maintain the sanctity of marriage, agreeably to the principles set forth in the word of God. We must remember that the Church is one in all places. She has to deal with the action of the various local legislatures in Natal, or in the Island of Mauritius, or in England; but still her duty is the same everywhere,—to maintain the sanctity of the marriage law as set forth in the word of God, and as the Church of Christ has hitherto received the same. Nothing would more clearly show that there is such a thing as the living voice of the Church of England, and what we mean by it. People sometimes think we mean the voice of an individual priest or bishop, or, worse still, our own private opinion. We mean, of course, first and principally, the voice of our convocations at Canterbury and York, and under them the voice of the bishop sitting in the chair of his synod, surrounded by the priests of his diocese, and speaking as their representative in their names and with their consent, and saying what is the law of the Church in such matters as the diocese may decide for itself.

The Worshipful and Rev. T. E. ESPIN, B.D., Chancellor
of the Diocese of Chester.

I SPEAK somewhat at a disadvantage, seeing that I am one of those who have been held up to you as the receivers of money who do nothing for it. Now I have felt it rather hard on the part of my neighbour, the Dean of Manchester, to say that; and before I sit down I shall show the Christian virtue of charity, and return him good for his hard words. I would venture to say, as regards that point, one general thing—certainly, as regards myself and my registrar. We do receive amounts, but what we do receive we receive in our official capacity for marriage licences. If we were to charge on each occasion when we give legal advice or execute legal documents—as we have a perfect right to do—we should get a very great deal more than we do, if all the marriage licences were done away with. But I do agree with the dean—if it was the dean—when he suggests the desirability of reducing the cost of licences. I believe, in many dioceses, the charge for a licence amounts to as much as three or four guineas, and in Chester the charge is only £2; and of that, 10s. goes to the person who takes the affidavit, and 12s. 6d. goes to the Chancellor of the Exchequer for stamps. So that all that the sometimes over-vituperated officials of the diocese receive out of the £2 is 17s. 6d. For that, of course, two legal documents have to be prepared—the affidavit, and afterwards the marriage licence—and then the same have to be duly entered and registered and kept; and questions of a legal nature have to be answered, and when the officials receive between them only 17s. 6d., it is not an excessive remuneration for their labour. But I do think that £2 altogether is quite sufficient for a marriage licence, and wherever that is exceeded, there, I think, is extortion. At the same time that I thoroughly agree with the Dean of Manchester that marriage licences might and

ought to be cheapened, I would suggest that the Chancellor of the Exchequer is the person to appeal to, and not the Chancellor of the diocese. That 12s. 6d. might very well be reduced to 2s. 6d., for all practical purposes. Then, as regards a point which Canon Temple has brought forward, that in the case of minors the consent of their parents or guardians ought to be ascertained, it has been our practice always, in the diocese of Chester, to require the sworn testimony of either the parents or the guardians; and I have no manner of doubt that it is within our power to refuse to grant the licence if the consent of parents and guardians is not in such cases duly attested. The next point is respecting uniformity of fees for marriages. Now that is a point, also, in which we have done something in the diocese of Chester. The Chancellor of the diocese has a power—which I believe has escaped some of my brethren, the other chancellors of dioceses—under an Act of Parliament, of absolutely fixing and determining the fees for marriage in new parishes. Now, in the diocese of Chester a very large proportion of our parishes are new; in the archdeaconry of Liverpool an immense majority of our parishes—probably four-fifths—are new parishes; and in all these I have the power of determining the fees. Now I always have fixed the fee for marriage by banns—everything included—certificate, and publication of banns, and all the rest of it—at 5s. altogether; and I have fixed it at that figure because I do think it is a most unwise thing that the fee for marriage in the Church should exceed the amount for which a man can perform the civil ceremony called marriage at a registry office. Five shillings is the amount for which it can be done at the registry office, and therefore I always fix 5s. in the diocese of Chester. Now, I ought to say that I have never, in any case, found any difficulty with my reverend brethren the clergy, in this matter. But I have felt it my duty, and I always do it, to sit every three weeks during the term, in open court—and the settling of fees is always done in court—after due communication to the incumbent and churchwardens, and every parishioner has the opportunity of making any remarks, an opportunity which they sometimes exercise. In each case, the clergy have very gladly accepted my decision on the point, and have most cordially concurred in the reasons for it. We have in the diocese of Chester several large towns, and I sometimes make it my business to ask the civil registrars how many marriages are solemnised by them in their offices; and I have observed in the last few years that there is not only no increase in the civil marriages in the registry office, but that, as far as I can judge, there has been a decided diminution in them; and I believe that is greatly due to the fact that marriages can take place in the church, by banns, under the system which I have instituted, with as little cost as is incurred at the registrar's office. I believe that people, if you can give them the fair opportunity on equal grounds, would very much rather be married in church than go through this same civil formality in the registrar's office. I do think, now, that that is something for the chancellor to have done; and if the chancellors, as a rule, resided in their dioceses, and looked after their business, the scandals of this and various other matters would not have arisen. And now, before I sit down, let me return my neighbour, the Dean of Manchester, a little kindness for his hard words. He has just informed me that the Bishop of Manchester has recently issued an order, by which all marriages in that city, solemnised after banns, are to cost 4s. 6d., everything included, thereby underselling us in the diocese of Chester by 6d.

*... a course of law has been made in the ...
... Rev. R. A. Cayley. Rev. John Oakley. ... 309
... the ... says, ...
... would be the right office.*

REV. REGINALD A. CAYLEY, Scampton, Lincolnshire.

I SHALL not enlarge upon the references made by Mr. Mayow to the book of Leviticus, but there is a point which is of very great importance, and no one seems to have touched on it. It is this: our Lord's own words on the subject. Men popularly suppose that our Lord speaks of divorce, as in a case of infidelity on the part of husband or wife: He specially points out that the only case of separation of man and wife is antenuptial impurity. If you only look at our Lord's words, you will see that. I think if you look at the Greek, you will find it is not adultery he speaks of. As an instance of it, take the case of St. Joseph in regard to our Lord's own birth. He was a just man, and not willing to make the blessed Virgin a public example, acted not on account of infidelity, but supposing that there was something against her before. Another point as shewing the close connection there is between man and wife in God's law, is in the fact that the genealogy of our Lord is traced through St. Joseph, not through the blessed Virgin. The Divorce Act is certainly a scandal, and the only way by which we can be relieved of the way it presses upon us Churchmen, viz., allowing our churches to be desecrated by the so-called re-marriage of adulterer and adulteress, is by agitation. "Agitate, agitate, agitate," said a politician years ago; and the only way we can do that is by a regular organisation of Churchmen, and bringing a strong pressure upon the bishops and archbishops, in order that they may see that the Church does feel on the subject—that it is a really sore point and not merely a controversy—that it does not simply touch a man here and a woman there, but it is a sore point through the length and breadth of the land. Another point is,—can there not be some mode by which people who have gone before the civil registrar, and had a civil marriage, may come to church afterwards to receive the blessing of the Church, and whether the latter half of the marriage service beginning with the Psalm may not be said over them? As the case at present stands, I fancy a clergyman would be liable to a penalty of some kind or other for thus performing a part of the service; he could not perform the earlier part because of the betrothal in the registrar's office. If the law could be relaxed so as to allow this, those who are anxious for the blessing of the Church could have it placed within their power, although they had been married by the registrar. As to the publication of banns, it is a great difficulty, one knows, in a large place like Sheffield, or Bradford, or Halifax, where one hears a great string of names. If instead of publication of banns, the names and addresses of those intending to marry might be published in the local newspapers for three weeks in succession, it would entirely stop clandestine marriages. This would be a complete solution of all the difficulties which constantly arise. Everybody would know everybody's business, and the consequence would be that lawful impediments would be immediately found out. There would then be a possibility of preventing illicit marriage. I do not wish to detain you any longer.

REV. JOHN OAKLEY, Vicar of St. Saviour's, Hoxton.

NOTHING was further from my thoughts than addressing the meeting when I entered the room, but I cannot refrain from adding the expression of my deep satisfaction and sympathy with the observations which fell from the Dean of Manchester. May I demur a little to one phrase which fell from Mr. Temple in his paper? I think I heard him say that the statesman had perfect liberty to maintain

the religious rites of marriage to be a superfluous thing, claiming for himself equal liberty to stigmatise the secular ceremony before the registrar as an "impious thing." I venture to demur very strongly indeed to that expression. I do not think anything in the Christian theology or morals requires us to regard any declaration or certificate of marriage resting upon consent and publicity, as in any way an "impious thing." I venture to vindicate the sanctity and the good character and the religiousness of any such marriage, even only before the registrar. I was thankful to hear the Dean of Manchester say that he hoped to see the civil ceremony compulsory in every case. I regard the working of the *Code Napoleon* in France, already cited, as decidedly an important fact. It may be perfectly true that ideas in France are not the same as in England; it may be true that the hold of the Church is not as strong in England as it is in France; but, on the whole, I do not in the least think there would be any falling-off whatever in the religious solemnization of marriages. On the contrary, I think that religious solemnization would be practically thought more of, and perhaps increasingly used; and on this ground, viz., that the people, especially the humbler orders, do care more about the things which take them some trouble to get if they want them. We have tried cheapening and facilitating and offering things long enough; but cheapness in shillings, and high regard and respect for the thing obtained, are not always inseparable. We have seemed to them to be trying to popularise marriage for the sake of the fees. I know churches which are always placarded with bills announcing a low tariff for marriages, as if it was the principal business of the Church and its clergy. It is the Church's pecuniary interest in it that I want to keep a little more in the background. Requiring the double ceremony, either separately or together, or rather, requiring the civil one and leaving the other to the conscience of the parties, would tend gradually and indirectly to produce that effect. I myself have married a couple at a large west-end church, with a German Prayer-book in one hand and a French Prayer-book in the other, having some reason to suppose that the man was a German Jew, and knowing the woman to be a French Roman Catholic by profession. Now, the privilege of solemnly blessing such a contract in the name of Christ, does not appear to me to be a privilege worth contending for. To require the civil ceremony, and to leave the religious part to the option of the parties, would, I believe, be the right way. It would, of course, dispose of the whole difficulty of the re-marriage of *divorcés*, which has been referred to so constantly this evening; their alleged claim would have disappeared. Then, as regards the question of fees, I very strongly advocate, at all events in poor neighbourhoods, *none at all*. That is not at all the same thing as lowering them to attract business. At the same time, I have practised for years the suggestion which fell from the Secretary of the English Church Union, of having an offertory, according to the rubric. The marriages in my neighbourhood are monopolised by a church which takes brevet rank as a mother-church, and we have scarcely added to the number of ours since we adopted the rule of exacting no marriage fees whatever, but simply explaining to the parties that they were expected to bring a thank-offering to God and put it into a bag, nobody knowing what it was till the service was over, and this goes into the general offertory account, and in fact pays a lay official. The total of the fees has slightly *risen*, the number of marriages not having very materially increased; and I have never, in more than one or two cases, felt anything like a passing sentiment of surprise that the parties should not have put more in than they have. The result, according to the circumstances of the people, has been a decidedly higher rate of offering than you would have expected. I would recommend the disuse, in poor parishes, of any formal fee whatever. Some difficulty was made about the publication of banns after the second lesson. That is never done, in my church, after the second lesson. The rubric provides for it

after the Nicene Creed. I believe myself that by far the most convenient course is to take the banns book into the pulpit and publish them there. The provision for its being done after the second lesson is wholly parliamentary, and has reference only to the case of churches where there is but one service, so as to make its being done in the evening—after the second lesson—as legal as when done in the morning, as the Prayer Book directs. I was greatly struck by what I observed in Rouen Cathedral this year. The whole of the congregation having gone into the nave, for the sermon, several minutes of the time was occupied by a clergyman reading out the banns from the pulpit and publishing a heap of notices, before another one began to preach. It seemed the most fitting thing in the world. It is almost impossible to over-estimate the objection and dislike the poor have to Church fees, as fees. But I am very glad indeed that this question of marriage laws and fees has found its place upon the platform of the Church Congress, and it should have no unimportant place if you really desire to re-attract and reconcile the humbler classes of the working men of England with what is called the Church of the People.

Rev. JOHN EDDOWES, Vicar of S. Jude's, Bradford.

WHEN I came upon this platform it was simply to say what has now been better said by the last speaker. I believe there is no repugnance on the part of poor people to the service of the Church, and no preference for the service, or whatever it be, in the office of the civil registrar; the objection is to the publication of banns, and to the publicity thus given to their intended marriage. One way, no doubt, to meet this difficulty would be the cheapening of the licence; but with all respect to the chancellor of the diocese of Chester, if the poorer people are to be put upon an equality in this matter with their richer neighbours, £2 is too large a sum to charge for a licence—2s. would be nearer the mark. One word as to the time of the publication of banns. I have *not* in my church a late celebration of Holy Communion with sermon every Sunday, and so I cannot publish the banns, as many of my brethren do, from the pulpit. My practice has been, for many years, to publish them, *not* as the rubric directs after the Nicene creed, but at the early celebration. I have for some years, too, adopted the plan of having no fee at all for any service whatever; and though some who come to be married value their wives at the small sum of a threepenny bit, or even a penny—at least such are sometimes the offerings made—others give more as an offering than they would pay as a fee, and so my experience exactly accords with that of the last speaker—that the amount received in offerings is very much the same as that formerly paid in fees. In the effect upon the people, however, there is all the difference in the world between making an offering to God for a blessing received, and paying a fee to the minister for a service done. May I also recommend not only the abolition of fees, but the painting on the notice board *outside* the church such a notice as that which appears upon my own—"No fee taken for any office of the Church."

The Venerable Archdeacon FFOULKES, Montgomery.

THERE is one thing which I think is very advisable,—that persons who issue licences should be more careful than they are as to the question of residence. I know "residence" is a very indefinite thing. I believe many years ago Lord

Selborne thought that "reasonable" residence is all that could be required. The law says it is necessary to reside fifteen days. Lately, however, I have heard of a marriage licence being issued when a person at Doctors' Commons said, "merely take a lodging and sleep a night there; that is sufficient." That indeed is a minimum of residence. Another point I would mention is this: it seems an extraordinary thing that the law should impose a penalty of fourteen years' penal servitude upon any person that falsifies the marriage register, and that there should be no means of inflicting this punishment for the offence. Now I believe it is left to the clergyman to bring the action, if any, for such transgression; and the Government will not assist him. I know a clergyman who proceeded against a man for such an offence, and was beaten, and I believe the costs fell upon him. Recently I myself found out a young man going to marry another man's wife. By chance he came into my parish one day, and I said to him, "now, you are going to marry another man's wife; you know it perfectly well. You know her husband was alive last Christmas. If you marry that woman you will be tied to an adulteress for the rest of your days." He tried to insinuate that it was not true. Nevertheless he went and married that woman shortly afterwards at the registrar's office. I had given information to the registrar, but I unfortunately, by mistake, gave her married name, whereas she went and got married in her maiden name. I wrote at once to the Registrar-General, stating the fact, and telling him that I was prepared to prove the man was alive. The reply I got was that the Treasury would not prosecute. By way of redress they sent me down, from the Registrar-General's office, a placard setting forth in very large letters that there was this tremendous punishment for any transgression of the law for falsifying the marriage register, and they expected me to put this on my church-doors, when all my parish knew perfectly well that this had taken place, and would merely have understood from it that there was this severe punishment due for the offence, but that no one need fear it would ever be inflicted.

The CHAIRMAN.

I SHOULD like to contribute one very small matter of experience which has come within my knowledge, and in which I was to some extent a sufferer. It does not appear that in the glorious ambiguity of the law there is any very certain penalty attached to taking a false oath before a surrogate. Such a false oath was taken before me some years ago, in which a man swore that the girl he was about to marry was eighteen, when she was fifteen; that they had been residing fifteen days in my parish when they had only entered it by train an hour before; and that the consent of the father was obtained, when he had run away with her the day before. I communicated with the police; the man was arrested; he was committed for trial at the ensuing assizes, and I became the prosecutor. The indictment charging the man with the offence was framed in the form of misdemeanour, not of felony. My position as surrogate administering oaths, as an officer of an ecclesiastical court, was somehow not considered equivalent to the position of an officer administering oaths under the Queen's courts. The Judge directed an acquittal, on the ground that it was only oath against oath (although the facts of the case were not disputed), and finally, inasmuch as the indictment was laid for a misdemeanour, not for a felony, the whole burden of the costs, amounting to over £20, was thrown upon myself. It is true that on an appeal to the Home Secretary, stating the full facts of the case, these expenses were afterwards returned to me; but I mention this incident in order

to suggest that, in the new scheme for amending and codifying our criminal jurisprudence, perjury committed before a surrogate should be placed in the same category with perjury before other officers: that the law should provide some condign punishment for one who, as in this case, succeeded in defying the law, and, through no fault of either prosecutor or counsel, escaped scot-free.

ALBERT HALL, THURSDAY MORNING,

OCTOBER 3rd, 1878.

The Right Hon. and Most Rev. the LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK
took the Chair at 10 A.M.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE CHURCH TOWARDS POPULAR LITERATURE AND RECREATION.

PAPERS.

Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D.,

Editor of "Hand and Heart," "Home Words," etc.

A FRIEND once told me it took him in the pulpit twenty minutes to get under way. It will not do to follow this example at Church Congresses. We all learn one lesson here—the importance of brevity; and certainly a short paper, like a short sermon, has this advantage, that instead of exhausting the subject—perhaps I should say the hearer—it often sets other minds in motion, and so most effectually furthers the end and object the speaker or preacher has in view.

Without further preface, as a worker speaking to other workers, from whom I hope to learn far more than I can hope to impart, I will try, in dealing with the wide topic assigned to me, to be suggestive and not exhaustive.

Since it was my privilege to say something at Plymouth on the subject of popular literature, I may be excused if on this occasion I confine myself mainly to the second branch of my topic,—the Church's attitude towards *popular recreation*.

I do not propose to discuss the meaning the Congress attaches to the word "Church" (although Bishop Hooper says:—"Beware of deceit when thou hearest the name of the Church;" and it would certainly save a world of controversy if we all had clear and exact views on this elementary but most important point). But I think it needful to remark, especially in connection with this question of recreation, that I understand by the word Church, as it is now before us, simply the communicant members of the Church of England, whether clergy or laity. I believe much evil has arisen

from the notion that one law of amusement exists for the clergy and another for the laity. It may be that official character and dignity requires a little reserve—but as a principle, Christian recreation is equally lawful, as it is equally necessary, for all Christians. A Christian is “the highest style of man,” a king and a priest unto God. No official or ministerial distinction can ever make that wrong in the one case which is right in the other. I hold, therefore, that wherever a Christian would, as a matter of principle, feel his pastor to be out of place, he may be quite sure he would be out of place himself. If the ground be slippery ground, it is at least as needful for the layman as for the clergyman to avoid it.

Understanding then by the Church the communicant members of the Church of England, whether clergy or laity, I think our attitude towards popular recreation should be both *watchful* and *winning*.

I. It should be *watchful*.

It is not always easy to answer, or wise to try to answer, the question—“What harm is there in it?” There is a better question,—“What good is there in it?” Recreation must often be judged by its surroundings. As a general remark, to which I think few, if any, here will take exception, I am sure the atmosphere of the theatre *as it is*, the race-course, the opera, the public ball-room, and the ordinary music-hall, will not be found helpful to a close and happy walk with God. As Christians, therefore, watchfulness demands here, not a pharisaic, self-righteous, much less a denunciatory protest, but a candid and not a compromising testimony.

But apart from Christian judgment, these popular recreations, as they exist—and I cannot speak of them as they do not exist—must sadden and distress every thoughtful mind.

A writer in *Social Notes* (an admirable publication) thus refers to a music-hall a stone's throw from crowded Piccadilly. “Of the scenes and the language that passed I dare not write—they are best left undescribed; but I never yet spoke with any self-respecting and fairly educated mechanic who did not say, as I now say, that in numbering our social evils we may place music-halls among the first.” The *Telegraph* says:—“In any of our large towns a female servant or the daughter of an artisan would find it next to impossible to select a public place of resort where she could meet decent girls and respectable young men, and enjoy music and social talk.”

Of the theatre I fear we cannot say it has improved since the celebrated tragedian, Mr. Macready, forty years ago, in a letter to a young friend who wanted to become an actor, said:—“The profession of the stage is one that no well-regulated mind would adopt from choice.” Short of leaving the profession, a stronger sense of its perils could scarcely have been expressed. I think were Mr. Macready now living, he would with burning indignation have denounced the utterly abominable Haymarket performances which the *Times*, not long since, said “never should have been exhibited on any stage, nor in the presence of decent womanhood.” Let the Church's attitude be at least as watchful and uncompromising as the attitude of the *Times* when on this occasion it added,—“We warn the ladies of England to take heed in this matter.”

A writer in *Macmillan's Magazine*, who favours theatrical performances as such, but is constrained to admit that "the current tendency of the stage is to make immorality familiar," and that "only three or four theatres can be found in London where the plays are"—in his opinion—"unobjectionable," urges theatrical reformation. He thinks this reform should begin by the clergy themselves "attending the theatre;" that they should "not merely speak of the stage as the Bishop of Manchester has done, but take a step which he, apparently, has some reason for not taking,—i.e. witness in person the play they recommend."

I fancy the clergy (like the bishop, whose motive all must approve, and whose kindly feeling we should all imitate, however some of us may differ from his lordship) have a very good reason for not attending theatres: and I think our absence is far more likely to tend to a possible measure of improvement than our presence.

And here let me add my conviction that the introduction of a so-called *religious* element into theatrical performances, as at the Polytechnic last Easter, would be to increase rather than lessen their influence for evil. I hold that the sacred and most solemn experiences of the Christian life ought never to be made the subject-matter for amusement or entertainment at holiday or other seasons. The unseemly mixture of things that so widely differ was severely commented upon at the time in one of the secular newspapers. Better the theatre itself than a counterfeit. Better by far the performance of plays, especially if we could have them enforcing domestic and social lessons, than the parody of the divine truths which are the essentials of our holy faith.

How far Christian influence might be brought to bear on the managers of theatres and music-halls I cannot venture to say, but I think something might be done by candid and kindly remonstrance. Even their supporters admit that they are not what they should be. Very few of the audience would miss the aside-vulgarisms and inuendos now frequently introduced—and many would be very thankful for their absence. Might not a straightforward but private appeal to the managers secure a measure of reform? Of course we must not expect too much. The world's amusements will not be reformed as we could desire until the world itself is reformed. Change the man; give him a taste for higher and truer pleasures; then, but not till then, the law of recreation in which he will delight—the law of perfect liberty—will be the law of his God.

And this remark may, I think, fitly introduce a few words on popular recreation in connection with Sunday observance. No one could be more alive than I am to the evil wrought, morally as well as religiously, by the open public-house on the Lord's-day. But to meet that evil, as some have proposed, by what is termed the counter-attraction of the museum, the picture gallery, the music-hall, the aquarium, the theatre, would, as far as I see, be to adopt a very bad form of homœopathic treatment. I do not think in this instance "like" would "cure like."

It is of course easy to say, "We mean to stop at the museum, the picture gallery, or the aquarium": but will others agree to this? Mr.

Buckstone, when advocating the opening of museums, was once reminded that theatres would follow. "I should like to know," he said, "whether there is one actor or actress that would work on Sunday." Alluding to his own experience he continued—"I know what it is on a Saturday night, after a hard day's work and many anxieties, to exclaim—and I have frequently exclaimed—Thank God, to-morrow is Sunday." Why should not the attendants at museums and picture galleries and aquariums be permitted to make the same exclamation? If otherwise, on what ground can actors claim exemption? Or, to use another illustration, why should we not have our daily papers on Sundays—editors and printers and news-agents and news-boys, all engaged in their usual avocations? The truth is, the main objection in all such cases is the same—the *increase of labour* and the *continuance of the pursuit of gain* on the day when all need the true recreation of rest.

I say the recreation of rest. Recreation and the Sunday are to my mind almost synonymous words: and rest as a chief element of recreation is the need and the right of all. Not that all can rest absolutely and entirely from labour: but all work, physical and mental, should be minimised. The question who is to do the minimised work that necessity or mercy requires, should be settled by the application of the great law of Christianity:—"Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." This law is easily applied to the proposed opening of places of amusement, and also to railway, cab and omnibus, and carriage traffic. For amusement or mere convenience, the many should not sacrifice the right and the necessity even of the few. Indeed the few would in that case soon become the many. For if man's pleasure or man's money is to be the law of the Sabbath, the wheels of labour will speedily run as rapidly on the first day as on the other six.

God's law of benevolence reads—"Six days thou shalt work, and on the seventh thou shalt rest." But the pursuit of individual pleasure or gain would soon rob this law of its divine benevolence, and man's selfishness would render it—"Seven days thou shalt work, and not rest or recreate at all."

I hope I have made it clear that I am not advocating a *gloomy* day of rest. I think the *joy* of the day is as essential an element of its observance as the rest of the day. If it is not a happy Sunday in our homes and in our hearts, it isn't truly Sunday to us. No effort should be spared to make the day a day of household joy. In our homes and in our schools everything should be done to interest the young. The most attractive books, and pictures, and music, and if possible curiosities and illustrative specimens of God's wonderful works—collected or noticed in nature's open volume—all should minister restful pleasures as well as profit to the mind.

But what I want to say is this: so far as *public amusements* on the rest-day are concerned, I hold it would be a grand mistake to introduce them as a counter-attraction to the *public-house*. Museums and picture galleries would indeed utterly fail to attract public-house goers, and theatres and music-halls would only intensify the evil.

Rather let us befriend the poor publicans themselves by inducing them to strike for rest and liberty. Publicans are Britons, and "Britons never should be slaves:" compelled to stand at their bar (it might be a criminal bar) for seven days, whilst others, bakers, for example, sell for only six. If we can do without Sunday bread we can certainly do without Sunday beer—or we can have it bottled.

The practical issue of any movement calculated to turn the day of rest into a day of amusement—recreation it would not be—was well illustrated a few weeks since by a correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* who, after describing a Sunday in Paris—with evident personal indifference to any claim of the day to Divine appointment—deprecated nevertheless a similar Sunday in London, on the ground that whereas the Parisians drink light intoxicants "we drink the very strongest of liquors, and our places of licensed victualling are merely places where the largest number of sots can get tipsy in the shortest space of time." Hence, he argued that "Sunday in London, with all the public-houses, all the theatres, all the music-halls, thrown unrestrictedly open from morning to night, would exhibit the most horrible Saturnalia that the eye ever beheld, that the ear ever heard, or the heart ever sickened at."

The need of watchfulness in order to the preservation of England's Sunday from the unchecked influence of a mere pleasure-seeking spirit, could not be urged in stronger words than these.

II. But I must hasten on to say a few words, and they must be few, on what I have termed the *winning* attitude of the Church towards popular recreation.

I think the pursuit of recreation is a good sign of social and religious health. It would be a sad day were it said in merry England, "The mirth of the land is gone." We want recreation: only instead of the wrong sort we want the right sort. The Irish definition, "Taking it easy—or as easy as you can," would hardly apply to the frivolous and wearying round of dissipation, misnamed pleasure. "I believe," said the Archbishop of Canterbury, when Bishop of London, "there are no persons in the world so overwhelmed with their own peculiar business as those who come to London to enjoy themselves during the season."

It were well to encourage the feeling that the truest and best recreation may be found in the *home*. Recreation abroad is often very hard work, whereas recreation at home even turns work into pleasure. The father making toys for his children, decorating the walls of his home with Landseer's pictures in self-made frames, constructing some useful or ornamental piece of furniture for home use or an industrial exhibition—is not this work that deserves to be called recreation? And what applies to the father may apply to all the members of the family.

But referring now to what is understood by popular recreation, I believe Christian enterprise could hardly find a more important and useful field for its exercise than this. Why should we not have pure and attractive entertainments of the highest class—the best panoramas, the best dissolving views, the best lectures and readings,

the best songs (a good song-writer is a national benefactor—songs are generally so very silly)—in short, the best novelties of every kind? Why should we not form a Church of England Recreation Society, aiming at the wide extension of recreative entertainments for the people?

The clergy might do much in this direction. Let them preach about it. In large towns let them make it a parish necessity to have a recreation hall, with refreshment rooms, reading rooms, and library for the loan of books on Sunday and week-day. If possible let there be a gymnasium attached, and good swimming baths; also a cricket field for England's noblest game, and provision for boating, archery, croquet, and lawn tennis. Let there be a well practised drum and fife band for the young folks. Let musical and other entertainments be given. Let a really good magic lantern be procured. Let telescope, and microscope, and telephone, and phonograph, tell their marvels. Let Industrial and Picture Exhibitions be held. Let there be the Summer and Autumn Flower Show. Let there be the yearly excursion to some place of interest: and the social meetings at Christmas and the New Year—the mixing of the classes, rich and poor, which is so helpful to the elevation of both. Let carol singing be made productive of funds for a good tea for the old folks, and then let the old folks give a "Robin dinner" to the young folks. In many ways the craving for recreation may be gratified; and the clergyman's interest in this direction will win him the hearts of the people to receive the higher message of "good tidings of great joy" which he brings.

No doubt this winning attitude of the Church will involve the spending of a little money. But a good deal may be done with a little. Moreover, I believe the clergy will always find plenty of money if they can only show business men like George Moore that there will be a "good return." I don't say £70,000 or £100,000 may not be well spent in restoring a cathedral, or £20,000 in building a church (especially if a good congregation with 500 or 600 communicants be secured to fill it), or £5,000 in purchasing a painting, or £500 in purchasing a piece of Dresden china—the circulation of money is a good thing—but I often wish our men of wealth would make a hobby of our overgrown parishes, and cultivate them with personal interest, working hand in hand with the pastor, trading with the Lord's money, not giving merely, but looking out for plans, and then working at them, as business men do, for practical results. They *would* get a good return. Business done for their Heavenly Father would bring down a blessing on their other business; or, if not, a blessing on their children, in the habit of benevolence acquired, and the memory of a philanthropic Christian parent when he was gone to receive the Master's welcome, "Well done." Has not Lord Shaftesbury had a "good return"? And why should there not be Lord Shaftesburys everywhere—using the one talent, if they have not, like him, the ten?

I find the subject of popular literature must devolve mainly upon those who follow me. I could startle many of my hearers with extracts from blasphemous and vicious publications which circulate

widely amongst the masses. Thomas Cooper, 10,000 copies of whose books on the Evidences I am hoping, if a sufficient fund can be raised, to place in every working man's library in the land, assures me that there are at least 100,000 of this class who hold the abominable atheism of Bradlaugh. I could adduce also examples of the open and disguised rationalism, and slightly veiled sensuality, which is equally welcomed by those in a higher rank. But I would rather urge the glorious opening the printing press now affords, as the Church's lever, to reach those who can never be so effectually reached in any other way.

I think the clergy should preach about popular literature as well as popular recreation. I should like to see an Ephesian bonfire in every parish. And then let good reading be recommended. Let suitable books be named for the home library—a Family Prayer Book, biographies, tales, history, magazines. A week-evening lecture on "God's modern miracle," the printing press, would render service. Then a few words to a bookseller in a parish or to a railway book-stall manager may do much good. I have known a poison-shop changed into a food-shop in this way. In villages a book-shop in one of the cottages might easily be started, which would often give occupation and maintenance to some suffering one incapable of hard work. I think also a Sunday Free Library would render great service. Let the books be really interesting, Sunday Tales abounding for the young folk, and let the books be given out on the Sunday morning, free of any charge, and returned on the Monday morning, and I believe the result would be highly satisfactory.

Of the clergyman's own use of the printing press I have not time to speak. As a recreation a printing press in a rural parish would interest many. But the use of local newspapers—furnishing a column now and then—and the monthly local magazine, supply full scope for work in this direction. I don't mean preaching scope. Preach in the pulpit: and be content with "a word in season" in the newspaper, or on the local page of the magazine. There is an overdoing, which sometimes proves an undoing. "A word in season" is better than a sermon out of season. A startling religious fact in a secular newspaper, or a temperance anecdote in—I must not say an in-temperate newspaper—is more likely to be useful than the same fact in the pulpit, or the same anecdote in the admirably conducted *Church of England Temperance Chronicle*. I should add that, wisely and prudently worked, the printing press thus employed may be a costless machinery. What is good, people will buy. But in poor parishes I think men of wealth might be found to render any needed help. £10 given to secure the sale of £100 worth of good reading, paid for by the people, comes up to George Moore's idea of "good returns." It is a far better plan than giving away £150 worth: for what is bought is sure to be read.

To conclude—in the words I used at the Plymouth Congress—"I believe the clergy of the Church of England have it in their power to introduce good reading into every home in the land. They may make the bookseller's shop a self-sustaining station for mission work and pure literature distribution all the year round. And I do

not think any more effective means could be employed to win back those who have forgotten, in this Christian land, that in their Father's house there is "bread enough and to spare."

REV. HARRY JONES, Rector of St. George's-in-the-East, London.

IN considering the attitude of the Church towards popular literature, I would first speak on one branch of a large business,—those publications of the cheaper sort which Mr. Mudie ignores, which are seldom sold by news-boys in the streets, and are chiefly supported by such as have been taught at elementary schools. I mean those penny periodicals and halfpenny fictions which are closely printed on thin paper, and mostly retailed in the small shops of back streets.

We are more or less familiar with this kind of literature, perhaps less than more. Anyhow it has got to itself the character of being flimsy, sensational, and frequently mischievous. And I suspect that it is of this what many think of first when considering the attitude of the Church towards popular literature. Its sale is enormous, and if it does not represent proportionate influence, it certainly measures and reveals such appetite for reading as is felt by immense masses of our population, especially in towns. No doubt it occasionally exhibits phases acutely distasteful to the refined reader, or distressing to the moralist.

But even well-accredited periodicals are not invariably wholesome, and in respect to mere style there are diversities of taste, about which it is idle to dispute.

The cheapest literature has more to be said for it than many think. Anyhow, it fulfils one condition which some ambitious authors at least may envy: it is found to be entertaining. It not only gratifies the repose of the adult, but it is attractive to many thousands of boys and girls, who find in it an escape from the pressure of importunate toil, and the meaner circumstances of life. They do not travel. They cannot afford to buy or hire shilling magazines. They have very small direct knowledge of leisurely or educated society. Their world, though numerously peopled, is marked by sameness and monotonous experience. Their surroundings are small and dull. Thus they eagerly welcome the cheap fiction which carries them out of their exclusive atmosphere, and for an hour introduces them to a questionable aristocracy, or unfolds the exploits of wild adventure.

I do not however know that this cheap reading is radically unlike that which is most affected by the so-called educated classes; many people who are found in them read for amusement as well as edification. The dish is no doubt often more highly seasoned, but the meat is much the same. Love and war, crime, thrilling personal incidents, startling situations, lively conversation, daring aggressive views, sport, and uncivilized travel, form the staple of the most favourite books and periodicals of the superior circulating library. The appetite has been felt and fed in some shape time out of mind;

and in so far as the Church gives sound instruction and widely helps in the formation of a righteous view of life and its duties, popular literature of every class is found to be the more wholesome. I say every class, for money price does not always measure moral worth. A magazine is not inevitably more edifying or even entertaining because it costs half-a-crown instead of a shilling. As the teaching of the Church is healthy, and accepted by the people, their crop of literature of all sorts is wholesomely affected.

There are, however, conditions or aspects of our present cheap literature which it is well for the Church to consider. I venture to think that it is not so hurtful as some imagine it to be. I have already alluded to one of its effects: it entertains. It carries many, tied down to monotonous work, out of their dull round for a while, and the exigencies of their condition hinder their dropping out of real life into that world of morbid sensationalism in which the *idle* devourer of novels sometimes leads an unhealthy and useless existence. Amongst working people, the taste of fiction is inevitably balanced, and in some measure corrected, by that of fact.

The cheapest popular literature contains, moreover, much information. It is instructive, as well as found to be entertaining. One day this summer, about a week after the news of the accession of Cyprus had been made public, I was idly glancing at the contents of a poor news-stall in the east of London, and found the first page of a very cheap and flimsy periodical devoted to a map and description of that island. And this is but a specimen of the way in which publications which are widely circulated, but are considered to be obscure, pick up information in a moment, and present it to their readers. Again and again I have been struck and gratified by the amount of news of general interest acquired by the boys in our national school, through the reading of the cheapest papers by their fathers and themselves. Working people, in London at least, are commonly well posted up in current general intelligence. In respect to the morality and sound political sense of the commonest popular literature, there will of course, be different opinions, as there are concerning periodicals and journals of a higher reputation. Of course I except directly indecent publications which are secretly printed and disseminated, and which find depraved purchasers in every class; but in even the highly-spiced halfpenny fiction you will mostly find virtue triumphant. The wicked earl comes to a bad end. And the unrestricted utterance of what are called mischievous social and political opinions may hinder their becoming dangerously compacted. Attempt to repress them, and they assume exceptional importance. Let them fly, and they are the more likely to fly away. Anyhow, when you promote elementary instruction in such a country as ours, one of its natural results is a free and cheap press, and unless the Church is prepared to check any reading, it must not wonder, and can hardly complain, that weeds as well as chaff and straw are produced in the field of popular literature. It would be idle to expect otherwise. And, as I have said, the primary general work of the Church is to affect the condition of the people by sowing good seed, and encouraging healthy culture, rather than by depreciating such publications as are

not purposely immoral and indecent, and which last, the law of the land as well as general public opinion condemns.

Before I consider further the attitude of the Church towards popular literature, I would call your attention to something more that it does. Since the Church has, by its national schools, taken the lead in the promotion of elementary education, it has committed itself to a desire that people should read, and if they read, do so with facility. Now, no one can doubt but that cheap attractive publications have done much to develop this power. The child, on leaving school, often reads wearily, with the lip. The entertaining story soon enables him to read rapidly, with the eye alone, and thus prepares him to receive, at any rate without wearisome, repulsive effort, such good literary food as may be set before him. Moreover, the cheap literature of which I am speaking is somewhat polysyllabic, though it may not be classical. It does not affect verbal condescension for the illiterate. It may be said, in a great measure, to accustom the reader to the phraseology of educated language. Thus it enables an educated man to be understood when he uses the vehicle which is most natural to himself. It is sometimes asserted to be difficult for such a one to express himself intelligibly to the poor, but, certainly in towns, where the cheapest literature is current, this bar to his teaching is weakened if not removed; and in the country, local papers are fast producing the same result. They are generally printed for the most part in some city, perhaps Sheffield, possibly London, and with a page of local intelligence, find their way far and wide into the rural cottage. It is growing to be more and more true, every year, that if the clergyman has really anything to say, its reception need not be hindered by his use of the language which he would naturally employ. This is no despicable gain. He is not under the necessity, if he will believe it, of striving to be simple. He may generally preach and lecture without fear of being misunderstood, so far as the method of his communication is concerned. It is either the dulness of his matter, or his own inability to be graphic and attractive in language, which leaves him without an audience, or hinders his making any perceptible impression on such as he may have.

In looking at the attitude of the Church towards popular literature, I will now glance at that of our great religious publishing societies, and then at that of the individual clergyman.

The great societies have done very much, especially of late years, in providing sound and attractive reading for the public. But they might do more. Some of their publications are still occasionally overflavoured with the odour of goodness. It is, however, mostly in fiction, especially in tales for the young, which are bought more by donors than readers, that the goodness of which I am thinking survives. We all know the style to which I refer. The Sunday scholar or chorister is so conspicuously, not to say offensively, high-minded in his remarks about birds' nesting, that he fails to inspire the urchin into whose grubby fingers the pretty little volume is put. The small personage of the story is so abnormally considerate and correct that the boys are shy to admit him into their roll of heroes,

even though he converts a poacher, is permitted to sing a solo in an anthem, and is eventually honoured with a choral funeral. Some of these goody tales not only consume literary ingenuity which might be better employed, but they present unreal pictures of life, and tend to create a suspicion of the heartier food which the societies provide.

No one wants them to lower their Christian tone and aim. But their present success and popularity leads us to hope that they may at length wholly exorcise the old ghost of goodness in their publications, and provide only such as the readers themselves, especially the young, would like to buy. Some exception must, I suppose, be made in the case of tracts which are, to a certain extent, constitutionally aggressive, and which circulate by distribution rather than by separate purchase; but this makes it all the more needful that they should be as agreeable as their nature permits. Divers indeed, now in use, notably prove that they can be pure and plain without loss of power, and good without being goody.

In considering the attitude of the Church towards popular literature, I must now say a word on that of the individual clergyman. If that is openly aggressive or contemptuous, it sets all its readers against him. Let him not be too hasty to judge the cheap journals and periodicals which the least educated affect. Perhaps they speak in a bitter class tone, and with unpleasant freedom of what he values most, or they provide fiction which he thinks too sensational for the young of his flock.

Possibly he himself takes in some paper which is not wholly free from asperity and the charge of being one-sided, and he may be occasionally tempted to read a novel which tends more to entertainment than edification. But let that pass. A graver thought remains. If he wishes, as he should, to know what the people among whom he chiefly ministers really think, there is much in popular literature which will convey to him this knowledge. It shows not merely the way of the wind, but the wishes of the heart. An honest study of it may help to deliver him from the utterance of mere orthodox platitudes, and set him to speak about matters in which those whom he wishes to teach are keenly interested, and so heartily shape his teaching to their temptations and troubles, their questions and wants. His materials, the things pertaining to the kingdom of God, are capable of application to all modes of life and conditions of man.

And, moreover, he might use the cheap popular and local vehicles of information and entertainment more than he does. They provide a channel through which he can speak, if he has anything to say to the point, and can say it with sense and good humour. He might use them more to convey information about parish events, and local history, social and natural. Their editors like news and facts, well told, and are willing enough to use such contributions from educated and intelligent men. But he may be able to deliver himself of more than facts, if he will keep his pen out of the sermon rut. Given a channel which the people use, he will often find it open to him if he will neither lecture nor scold, but write plainly, good humouredly, and sensibly. Thus his attitude towards popular literature will be neither antagonistic nor helplessly tolerant, but co-operative. Of

course he must not expect to find himself in the serene atmosphere of the *Church Times* or the *Rock*; but if he can keep his temper, and not mind a sharp occasional rub, he may teach some wholesome lessons through cheap popular literature, as well as learn some from it. It exists. It is a growing fact. And the clergyman who honestly and heartily uses it will do far more to correct that which is questionable in its contents, than he who, seeing only what he dislikes, continues to bark without being able to bite, and, in so far as his individual attitude and influence is concerned, alienates those whom he might have drawn towards a better life, and whom he is bound so to draw by all the means within his reach.

The thoughts which I have ventured to set before you in reference to popular literature leave me no sufficient time to speak of the attitude of the Church towards popular recreations. Much, however, of what I have said about one branch of my subject applies radically to the other. Recreation in itself is right; and when it goes wrong the Church is bound to do its best to rectify, and not merely rail at it.

I can enter into no details. I would only remark that a distinction should be drawn between active and passive amusements. These last are likely to be most mischievous. They sometimes tend to relax the muscle of self-respect, and dissolve the genuine grit of humanity. Those, *e.g.* who take their chief pleasure in frequenting dramatic spectacles of the coarser sort, generally care little for any hearty play which tries the limbs and the lungs and cannot be shared without some exertion or self-command. They are apt to be more sensual than sturdy. They like to have that side of their bodily power addressed which finds its exercise in the indulgence of the passions appealed to. I do not believe in any elevating influence in such displays as I allude to. St. Paul indeed, says:—"Unto the pure all things are pure;" but then he must be pure. And this condition narrows the application of his sentence.

There are indeed places of popular recreation simply distressing to any right-minded man or woman who realises their character; but this distress is no valid excuse for abruptly and finally leaving the sensual and careless to go to the bad their own way. That surely is not Christian, nor becoming the attitude of the Church, which is called, not to condemn, but to save.

ADDRESSES.

The Rev. the Earl of MULGRAVE, Vicar of Worsley, Lancashire.

I INTEND to confine myself to one particular section of this subject—of the "Attitude of the Church towards popular Literature and Recreations." I shall further condense my subject by alluding in a general way to one form of popular recreations—the theatre. I am conscious that as I stand here and thus speak I am placing myself in direct antagonism to opinions of many older, wiser, better men. If there is need of excuse, let me say then that I am speaking as the representative of very many laymen, if not brother clerics, who equally with those who are opponents

of the theatre have in their heart love of their God and love of their mother Church. For the recreation afforded by the theatre to be ranked amongst those that are permissible, proof is, I suppose, required that the instinct or taste which seeks and finds its satisfaction in dramatic representation is innocent and not vicious. I believe that this is able to be demonstrated, for dramatic taste is but another vein of poetic sentiment, which to most minds is natural, if to some it is not. The theatres, besides offering satisfaction to a taste which is to its own nature perfectly pure, may surely be declared a most important agent in the education of the people. What other form of popular recreation is possessed of such wonderfully teaching-powers as the stage? I speak of it now in its purity, as it ought to be, not as it is. It has two voices by which it appeals to human heart and life—tragedy and comedy. Through tragedy it excites towards the attainment of the highest virtues, whilst it warns against the spurious attractions of evil. The tenderest emotions are provoked, sympathy stimulated and taught, the inner man braced up to play a noble part in the great drama of everyday life. Through comedy the folly and vices of a present age are held up to ridicule and scorn, the absurdities of a pampered and selfish society exposed to contempt, and so warned against imitation. The fact of its having become vicious is no argument against what is in its own essence virtuous. It may be surely admitted that these two great powers of tragedy and comedy have been perverted in a degree by the theatre, and yet not on that account should the theatre be declaimed against as a moral, and therefore social, evil. An organ or other musical instrument quite perfect in its construction cannot logically be charged with that awful discord which the fingers of an utterly unmusical person has caused. Blame the ignorance and unscientific touch of the player, but exonerate the instrument. Vice and buffoonery, the children of a depraved public taste, may disgrace dramatic art, but not on that account is the drama to be decried against. There have been those amongst our English actors and actresses who have recognised the science of the drama, who have exercised its beneficial powers, and made on human life its moral impression felt. There are those in the present day, I believe, who honestly strive to obtain for the stage what the stage has through its own insincerities been denied—the Church's sympathy. It is an easy matter, but I doubt its fairness, to blame the actor for the abuses of his profession. It may be questioned at whose door the sins if there are sins, vices if there are vices, of the actor and actress are to be laid? What has the Church done? Condemned, abused, denounced the theatres in councils, sermons, tracts, and platform addresses. But what has she done towards its moral reform? And will history allow it to be said that she has done nothing because she has diligently and carefully inquired into the matter, and found that the drama is in its essence an evil? Even if history would allow this, I dare to say that on its pages there is no record—no, and there never will be such a record—of it being the Church's duty, when brought face to face with evil, to leave that evil to become evil even to itself. Where has been the manifestation to the actor of that charity which is the attraction of the Cross? Where that holy sympathy which is its commandant? We are wasting time in crying out against existing corruptions of the theatre, and in attempting to refuse it a proper place in legitimate recreation. Some action is required, and that in the guise of reform. A society has been organised in Manchester called the Dramatic Reform Society, which surely may be said to be under the auspices of the Church when two bishops are amongst its vice-presidents. It has for its object theatrical reform. No doubt that such work will be found difficult; that it will be slow, testimony of history upon reforms declares. For ultimate success the Church as the Church should stand more boldly forward, and oppose the influence upon the recreations of her sons and of her daughters of a vitiated public taste. Fashion, that powerful influence diffused by the actions of the great in

name but not always noble in life, should be proselytised, and virtue should be made fashionable. Very many of the theatrical representations of the present day, whose moral tendencies are lowering, are, I fear, due to the patronage of an aristocracy that sometimes forgets its duties and responsibilities in the advancement of its own pleasures. Managers of theatres do not provide what they find their audiences do not approve of. Last year it seemed as if a thrill of religious fervour was pervading the English aristocracy when the names of so many noble peers, viscounts, and barons were announced as having been appended to a certain petition against introducing into society a supposed impurity, which petition was to be presented to the Queen of this realm. Alas! Apart from this paper there has been no public evidence of any higher standard of social and of personal life. Possibly even it might be found that out of that list of *pure-minded* noblemen very many have this last London season patronized, with their wives and families, those theatres where the representations were very questionable as regards purity. I do not say this in any spirit of bitterness; nor is it foreign to the subject before us. To the influences of public taste have been ascribed the decadence of the drama. This unhealthy and disordered condition of public taste must be due to some cause beyond itself. That cause seems to be, in addition to the circulation of a corrupting literature, the absence of any high moral standard in the lives, speaking generally, of those who form that society whose fashion operates upon a lower. The Church must be possessed of the moral influence of England's aristocracy if innocence and purity are to be the attendants of popular recreations.

" Example is a living law, whose sway
Men more than all the written laws obey."

I would advocate, in conclusion, on the part of the Church towards the stage, a sympathy which, whilst it is tender, shall be true. There must be no lowering by the Church of her standard to that of the world. Where she recognises a recreation as beneficial, let her through her laymen adopt it for her children's advantage. This work of theatrical reform is a special work for the godly layman; one that will be found to require the greatest prudence, the nicest tact, the quickest discrimination, the employment of all the talents of a true gentleman, the courage of a Christian man; one that must be given up bravely if found impracticable. But this work of the reformation of the stage must not be given up until a fair and honest endeavour has been made "that all that is beautiful shall live and all that is base shall die."

MR. WILLIAM SMITH, Sheffield.

THE custom has been to denounce the drama from the pulpit, and in other ways to inculcate and promote the conviction that the drama is an unmixed evil; or, at all events, so largely, and of necessity inseparably mixed up with evil as to be wholly and incurably injurious to the cause of morality and religion. Perhaps this has nowhere prevailed more than in Sheffield, owing to the uncompromising view taken by a deceased clergyman in this town, who for many years had most deservedly great influence. For nearly half a century did he once a year preach a formal sermon against the amusements of the stage, in which it was denounced as an unmitigated evil, a temptation and a snare. And so it fell out that once upon a time this anomaly occurred:—That when one of his grace's predecessors (Archbishop Harcourt) was entertaining the celebrated Miss Stephen, at Bishopthorpe, while she was fulfilling an engagement in the ancient city of York, and at a period, too, when the good old king George III. was frequently in the habit of spending

an evening at the play, it was stated from the pulpit in question that "No good Christian would or could go to the theatre." Music also, to be heard at a concert, was forbidden, or at all events regarded as a distinct transgression of that boundary line which should separate the amusements of those who were styled "the worldly," from those who styled themselves "saints." It is generally supposed that this great aversion to the theatre had its rise in the times of the Puritans. But one fine old Puritan does not seem to have shared in it. John Milton wrote—

"Or, to the well-trod stage anon,
If Jonson's learned sock be on."

But those times were succeeded by others of great profligacy and immorality, beginning with the Court and spreading downwards among all classes of society, and afterwards during the dreary period of the Georges, when all the sensuality of a former period remained without the liveliness and wit; and the stage must adapt itself to the habits and customs of the times, for

"The drama's laws the drama's patrons give,
And they who live to please must please to live."

But the drama is not of itself a thing impure or unclean. It has, notwithstanding the amount of obloquy which it has had to encounter, done more to raise the thought and feeling of mankind than many sermons. The greatest dramatist the world has ever seen has left on record his idea of the object and mission of the drama. The words are well known and oft quoted; they are familiar to you all, but they can never become hackneyed; their beauty and propriety (to use again his own language) "age cannot wither nor custom stale." Speaking of the drama, he says, "whose end, both at the first and now, was and is, to hold, as 'twere the mirror up to nature, to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time its form and pressure." The dramatic instinct is a thing inseparable from human nature. It is one of the first instincts which manifest themselves in childhood, and throughout life mankind are powerfully influenced by dramatic representations. As a teacher of great moral lessons, I think it is beyond all other influences. The Liverpool clerk (and this I believe is a well authenticated fact) who absconded with some thousands of pounds of his master's money, and who, happening shortly afterwards, in a distant town, to witness a representation of Mr. Tom Taylor's drama, "The Ticket of Leave," was so impressed by that representation, with the terrible consequences of embarking upon a career of crime, that he returned to his master, confessed his guilt, and made restitution of his plunder: I say that man had probably heard many sermons, and might have heard many more, without his heart and conscience being touched as it was by the fearful lesson which was presented to him by the drama. Well, then, the idea which, with all submission, I wish to enforce is this, that, whether you like it or not—whether I like it or not—the drama never will cease to influence powerfully the human mind. It is capable of being made not only a wholesome intellectual amusement and recreation, but of being rendered a great moral teacher, if properly cared for and directed. If neglected—still more if discountenanced, denounced, and deprived of that social and moral influence which is necessary to ensure it from degradation and abuse—it will become (or if you like, it will continue, as I fear it is already to a great extent) a powerful instrument of evil. I intended to bring before the Congress some notice of the Society for the Reform of the Drama, but the last speaker has already done so. His lordship mentioned that amongst its vice-presidents were two bishops, but he did not name them. One is the honoured Bishop of Manchester, and the other is well known and much beloved in this his native town, Dr. Moorhouse. It is also the fact that among the

warmest supporters of this society are the names of many of the leading actors and actresses of the day, showing that they feel a real anxiety to elevate and purify their profession. There is one other consideration in connection with this subject, to which, although it falls more within the domain of those who exercise the direct ministry of God's word, I must nevertheless allude. I look upon the fact of a number of members of the dramatic profession being among those who have helped to form this society, as a cry for help and Christian sympathy on the part of those who have sadly too often been treated with neglect, as though from the very circumstances of their profession they were placed outside the pale of ordinary ministrations, if not actually beyond all Christian hope. As a class they may have many faults; but, undoubtedly, they have many virtues. In no class or rank of life do you see greater self-sacrifice for the benefit of aged fathers and mothers, or for the less successful members of the family, than are to be found among the members of the dramatic profession. There is here a rich and ripe field for the Christian minister. But the work must be done with careful judgment and discretion; not rashly, nor with intemperate zeal. Most of all, it must be done with genuine sympathy. "Sympathy," said the late George Moore, "is the grand secret of life," and it is in this spirit of sympathy that this work must be conducted. Pharisaic pride, if such exists, must come down from its pedestal. There must be a perfect absence of the feeling, "Stand aside, for I am holier than thou." It must be by kneeling together as fellow sinners at the footstool of the great common Father Who is in Heaven, to Whom we present our petitions for pardon and for blessing through the atonement offered for the sins of all by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The drama is too powerful, too permanent an instrument of good or of evil, for us to neglect or ignore it. It will continue to operate; and whether for good or evil depends upon society. I would therefore say, with all deference, do not habitually absent yourselves from the representations of the stage. On the contrary, sanction them by your presence, and throw the whole weight of personal character and influence in society into co-operation with those who, however feebly or imperfectly, are striving to purify and elevate the drama, and to make it, as I have already said, not merely a wholesome, intellectual means of recreation, but also that for which I believe it was ordained, and the love of it so firmly fixed in the human mind—namely, a great moral teacher.

Rev. W. BOYD CARPENTER, Vicar of St. James', Lower Holloway.

IN speaking of the attitude of the Church with regard to popular recreations and literature, it seems to me that it is only fair and right that we should, in the first instance, endeavour to understand what is at the basis of the conscientious feeling which some have with regard to some amusements. It is not that the clergy of the Church of England are governed by any Puritanic fear of a certain class of amusements. There may be, and no doubt there is, a section which is still influenced by such a feeling; but, if I understand rightly the sentiments of others, there is a profound timidity in their nature, which arises from a deep sense of their responsibility. They do not quarrel with the drama, as such, but they quarrel with the quality of the drama. They do not quarrel with the novel as such, but they quarrel with the tendency of the novel. And if this is their feeling, I will put it to this great meeting of English Churchmen whether it is not a feeling which ought to be respected, because every one must admit that there has been entrusted to us a great and serious responsi-

bility, not only for the present, but for after generations ! Who does not feel that what is done in one era will become the parent of the action of a future generation ? We are not afraid so much of particular amusements as we are of the unseen subtle influences which help to mould the national character. We have to make a constant protest in the world on behalf of one idea. We believe that the greatness of nations and of peoples will never be found in the splendour of their wealth, the greatness of their resources, or the magnificent array of their battalions, but rather in the principles and sentiments by which the national heart is actuated. And therefore feeling this, we look with hesitation and doubt as to what will be the ultimate result of certain tendencies and opinions ; and one of the faults of the present day is that many of us are governed by accidental circumstances rather than guided by principles. And so it is not this or that class of amusements that we should think of, as the moral principles which they diffuse. And when men believe that to our hands are entrusted this sacred charge of witnessing against wrong wherever found, it may be forgiven them that they are anxious not to act till they see clearly their duty with regard to popular recreations and popular literature. You will hardly expect me to deal with the former ; but persons of every school of thought will agree with me when I say that we cannot but pray for God's blessing on every effort made by noble-minded men to reform the stage. It is with respect to another point that I wish to speak. It appears to me that one fact in our national life is too often over-looked. The pressure of business is now so heavy that business men have no leisure, and no escape from the constant cares and anxieties arising out of the tremendous competition with which they are surrounded : men are thus enervated with their daily toil. The brain and heart are over-worked ; and by a law of our nature the man betakes himself to some form of recreation. It has been said by an eminent scientific writer—" We are being drugged into imbecility ;" and the symptoms of mental weariness and intellectual langour are too often apparent on the faces of our city men. They must read ; but usually they can only do this in a fragmentary way. They love three sources of information—the daily newspapers, hastily scanned in the train whilst going to town ; the magazine on the table when they return ; or the novel taken up for a short time before retiring to rest. These are the ordinary recreations of many a wearied and tired business man, and his mind is formed by this spasmodic reading. You know by their conversation from what source they obtain their information ; the twang of the last leading article is heard on their tongues ; " their speech bewrayeth them ;" and the result is that they have a tendency to turn to the lighter class of reading, and their minds become as it were fragmentary. When they read they do not take up the book which is the most desirable, but the book that is lightest ; and it not unfrequently happens that the book that is the lightest is the lowest. It is wonderful how practical men can find any interest in such un-reality as that which is usual in the characters which many of such books present to them ; and to say nothing of the utter absence of dramatic art shown by these authors, they may be reckoned as master tailors, who, by a skilful arrangement of dress, make their heroes pass for men. These novels are deficient above all things in imagination. The imagination which is wanting in the book must be supplied by the reader, for their excellences are more fiction than fact. They remind one of the Irishman's horse. He recommended his animal to an English traveller as a poetical horse. It turned out to be the sorriest of jades ; and when he was asked why he called it a poetical horse, the Irishman replied—" Plase, yer honner, I call him a poetical horse, just because his virtues are more in imagination than in reality." I should be glad to see something done by the Church of England to meet this great evil—this fragmentary reading which produces such ill effects upon the mind. The man who catches up a newspaper or a magazine, or dips into

the third volume of a novel, must necessarily have a disordered mind. It is like a broken mirror which cannot reflect a single sun-beam perfectly, and only gives out a few scattered and distorted rays. All the knowledge obtained in this casual manner is productive of no lasting impression, and speedily sinks out of the memory and the thoughts. But is nothing to be done to save men from this fragmentariness of mind? Opinions are taken up on the flash of the moment; they are not carefully weighed and considered; and the result is that what are called the views of many men are only their predilections. They drift into thoughts, rather than form them by careful consideration. I think clergymen might try two or three methods to help their people to remedy this evil. The way to deal with it is not by denunciation, but by sympathy. If we remember always that all men are our brethren, and that we owe a brother's duty to them in every sphere of life, we might do a great deal towards bringing about a better state of things. We must diffuse the good to expel the evil, according to these Apostolic words:—"Be not overcome with evil, but overcome evil with good." What methods then can we suggest for this purpose? First, I would say we have, in preparing candidates for confirmation, opportunities of speaking to them of their general reading. We are in the habit now of recommending to them a great many little treatises and religious pamphlets, which are very useful to help them spiritually; but it is a period of which advantage should be taken to influence and direct their reading in a secular direction. We might arrange for them a little system of reading which would carry them through the best literature of the country, and perhaps stimulate them to pursue some of the paths of science, or at least to take an interest in the higher branches of knowledge. A great hindrance will be overcome when we can get them to persevere through the first chapter. The truth is that to master the first fifty or sixty pages of a new study is the hardest part of a task: and so we should take pains to help our young people over the technical threshold of each new study, and in that way, while we stimulate we should make for them an easy entrance into the higher branches of literature and scientific research. Another plan has been tried with some success; but it is more prevalent amongst Nonconformists than Churchmen. It is the formation of conversational meetings on other than religious topics: that is to say, subjects affecting literature, articles in the magazines, new discoveries (geographical and scientific) and the like. The clergyman or minister is present, and a healthy flow of conversation is kept up. In this way desires to be acquainted with these things are formed, and insensibly a taste for higher literature is created. Clergymen should not forget that their work is not in the pulpit only, but in the houses of their people as well; and they should become, not only spiritual teachers, but the friends and advisers of the parishioners and their children.

DISCUSSION.

REV. G. EVERARD, Vicar of St. Mark's, Wolverhampton.

It has been said this morning that in the matter of recreation we ought to have some principle. I think that principle should be that it must not be dissipation, but something which would refresh and restore the spirit for the actual work of life, rather than scatter the mental powers and unfit a man for the duties he has to perform. I do not wish to dwell on the subject of the stage, but may I say that when we look at it calmly and quietly as it is, and not as it ought to be, looking at man as he is and not as he might be, and putting those together there is a call upon us, in the words of the Apostle, "not to do evil that good may come." If a bag of gun-

powder is brought within range of the blacksmith's forge, there is a likelihood that something dangerous may happen; and when the gunpowder of sinful hearts is brought to the sparks of profanity and wickedness in our theatres, there is danger as to what the result will be. As a young man in business in Manchester, I for some time loved to go to the theatre; but when the Lord spoke to my heart of the reality of sin and of the love of Christ, I felt that the theatre must be abandoned or Christ be lost. It must be one or the other. An instance has been given of good done by a theatrical representation; but I will mention a case with a different result. A young man went to the theatre for the first time; he was caught in the snare, and felt its fascinations irresistible. He went seventeen nights in succession, and he was then a ruined man in soul, body, and character for his whole life. There are dangers, then, which those who advocate the theatre as a recreation should carefully look at. There is, however, another thing closely connected with the popular recreations of the day which ought not to be passed by, as it is an exceedingly great and destructive evil: I mean the racecourse and the betting book. In spite of their popularity in high places, Christian clergymen ought to speak out upon the subject of these evils. Those are beautiful words in which the late Charles Kingsley pictured a little of the intense selfishness and inconsiderateness for the losses and miseries of others—the envy, and who can tell how many sins besides, which belong to the daily life of the betting man. You will all recollect a picture in the Royal Academy of the gamester's career—the young man at Cambridge beginning his course, the young man of position married, the bailiffs in the house, the attic, and the pistol on the table—all representing what is too often a sad reality. Let us imitate in our pulpits with reference to this subject, the boldness of that servant of God who last night spoke out so thoroughly and plainly of the evils of intemperance; let us speak out boldly of the curses of the racecourse and of the theatre as it is in this age. At the same time, "the attitude of the Church" towards recreations ought not to be merely negative. As clergymen, we ought to throw our influence in every way we can into the support of wholesome recreations for the people. Much may be done by the increase of public parks and gardens, tastefully laid out with beautiful flowers, as we now see in some of the parks in London and on the Continent. The clergy may also well strive to connect the two subjects of temperance and recreation. The people's coffee-houses which are now springing up everywhere—I rejoice to say that in Wolverhampton and the neighbourhood we have just opened six new ones, and we have more which will soon be ready for opening—might be made more attractive by some pleasant and innocent recreations. I think, for instance, if we had regular and periodical temperance entertainments, they would not only create a lively interest in the temperance movement, but help to make the coffee-houses more completely self-supporting. We have, for instance, in our parish, such meetings in connection with the Church of England Temperance Society, at which generally from 200 to 300 people attend. They begin with a few words of Holy Scripture; then they have pleasant music and harmless singing, and a temperance address of not more than twenty minutes. The people are invariably pleased and anxious to come the next time; and in this way these gatherings are a great assistance in the matter of recreation. I will not trespass further upon the time of the Congress, except to say a word or two on the subject of popular literature. I was standing a few weeks ago in Strasburgh, by the statue of Gutenberg, the inventor of the printing-press, and was reminded of his dream. He thought that an angel came to him and said, "Destroy your invention—the evils it will produce will be more than the good—your invention will be a curse to the world," Gutenberg at first thought to destroy the art of printing in its birth, but at length the conviction dawned upon him that in the end truth must prevail, and to counteract the evils he foresaw, the first book he produced by his grand inven-

tion was the Bible. That story has a moral for us: it teaches the best attitude of the Church with respect to popular literature, saturated as it is with rank infidelity and gross immorality, and that the only way to meet those evils and counteract them is to scatter broadcast over the world *pure* literature. The thanks of the Congress, and of every member of the Church of England, ought to be given to my dear friend Mr. Bullock, for his noble and self-denying efforts to raise the tone and character of popular literature.

REV. ERNEST J. A. FITZ ROY, Rector of Abberton, Essex.

I TRUST that while the members of the Congress will weigh well the weighty remarks of those who have recommended a reform of the drama, they will not imitate the example of a member of Parliament, who having as a young man considered that entering the portals of a theatre would of necessity lead to his damnation, has now so completely veered round as to have formed one of a deputation to the Lord Chamberlain, in favour of opening theatres on Sundays. There is a moderation in all things, and legitimately used the drama is to be encouraged rather than condemned. My chief object, however, in rising is to repeat what I said at the Congress at Plymouth, on the necessity of a better understanding between churchmen and the press. Much more use might be made of the local press in chronicling church matters; but the conductors of newspapers must be treated with courtesy. I will instance what I mean by a story of what happened many years ago, where a bishop complained to Bishop Wilberforce that a local paper was always abusing the Church. "Have you asked the editor to dinner?" said the bishop. "Why, no," said his host. "Introduce me to him at our meeting, and let me ask him for you," was the quick rejoinder. This was done; Bishop Wilberforce made himself most agreeable to the obnoxious editor, and the less astute prelate was never afterwards troubled. During the present year, at the consecration of four churches at Barrow-in-Furness, where your grace and three other bishops were present, I observed the singular circumstance that in every London and provincial paper the same account of the proceedings appeared, more or less condensed. Had it been the failure of a bank, or the opening of a dock by a Royal Princess, some thirty or more pens would have set to work to record the different lights and shades of the event; but in this remarkable case of Church extension, owing to the apathy of churchmen, not one account appeared with the same passages from your grace's sermon and those of your right reverend brethren, no high churchman dwelt at greater length on the utterances of the Bishop of Carlisle nor did any evangelical pen give in greater detail the gospel warnings of the Bishop of Sodor and Man; while the interesting fact that all the public-houses were closed during the hour of service was entirely overlooked. What are wanted are brief, pointed, unvarnished, and impartial records of church work, sent early—not a week after date—to the different newspapers, and if that were generally done the ignorance of too many newspapers as to the very first principles of the Church will soon vanish away. What, in short, I recommend is more mutual confidence between the church and the press.

REV. BROWNLOW MAITLAND, London.

As the reading and speaking have gone on it has struck me that what I might call the foundation of the whole subject has never been touched upon at all, and, as it has presented itself forcibly to my own mind, I wish to put it before the section for what it is worth. It is this:—That the very divergent views on the subject before us which prevail in the Christian world, and which have found a partial expression this morning, have their root and origin in very divergent views upon much deeper questions. By this I mean that the position of the Church of the living God towards the world at large, and of Christianity towards the collective life of mankind, might be very differently regarded. It is possible on both these subjects to take a narrow view. You may think of the Church as a small elect company gathered out of the world, separated from it, fenced round from its practices and its busy life as much as possible, and bound to keep itself to itself, labouring to keep its members clear of outside influences, and to guide them as a pure, elect little flock, towards everlasting life. It is possible also to think of Christianity as an instrumentality simply and exclusively for preparing individual souls for the world to come. I believe that those narrower views of the Church and of Christianity have largely prevailed in certain portions of the Church. If I remember aright, in my earlier days I used to hear of one religious body in this country, the Quakers, trying to realise the idea to the utmost, to fence themselves off from the world and from any unnecessary communication with its art, its literature, its politics, its general life and aims, never admitting, I believe, a picture on their walls, or the sound of a piano within their dwellings—thus keeping themselves as much as possible a separate body, having as little as possible to do with the great and multifarious turmoil of the world. But another and wider view is possible. It is, that the Church is meant to take in the whole world—all its divisions, all its life, powers, and capabilities, and to gather them all to the feet of Christ—to make the kingdoms of the world become the kingdoms of God and of Christ; to comprehend the whole area of human activity, and to endeavour to ally itself with all that is pure and good, that God may be glorified in all the powers and faculties which He has bestowed. There is a wider view also of Christianity—that it is not exclusively the means of fitting individual souls for the life to come, but that it is the means of making the life of this world first of all a life worthy of God and of Christ. For my own part, it is this wider view both of the Church and of Christianity that I am inclined to take, and the more so the older I grow. Having been brought up in the narrower school, my earlier life was rather prepossessed on the side of the stricter view; but, mixing with the world, and being engaged in its literature, its employments, its busy life in one form and another, I have had irresistibly forced upon me this wider view of the relations of the Church and Christianity to the world at large. Now, this leads, I think, rather to the wider, it might be called, perhaps, the laxer, view of the position of the Church towards art and literature, and everything that comes within the general character of recreation. I am well aware that those who take this wider or laxer view are often twitted with the retort that it is because it suits the habits and inclinations of the individual who takes the wider view. Therefore, I venture to add for my own part, that I am not what may be called a recreation man at all. I was never inside a theatre or a ball-room; never on a race-course, and have never made a bet or played a game for money in my life. Recreations of the popular kind do not suit my temperament or inclinations at all. I rather sympathise with the language of a well-known statesman, who said that really “life would be tolerable but for its amusements.”

Therefore I do not speak with any personal bias upon the subject. I think most seriously that if the Church is to perform its mission towards the world at large, and to gather in all its various peoples to the feet of Christ, it must not take too narrow and too rigid a line upon these subjects. As far as each individual person's practice is concerned, I think that a person is bound, unless some very imperious cause interferes, to take that line which promotes his own personal edification and growth in grace. If a man finds that amusements interfere with his spirituality of mind, demoralise him, unfits him for prayer, make religious services and sacraments distasteful to him, he will do well to deny himself, and be strictly watchful against everything that secularises his spirit. But do not let me make my own practice a rule by which to judge others whose temperament or circumstances may be different. The true position is one of strictness towards one's self, combined with tolerance towards others. We must all feel that there is in many popular amusements an enormous need for purification. The theatres want purging most sadly, and there is a great deal in ball-rooms that might be greatly bettered. I should like to appeal to the gay leaders of fashion, to those ladies who are at the head of society, to cut short the duration of balls, and, if possible, cause them to terminate at midnight. The prolonging of these exciting festivities till the early hours of the morning is more demoralising, and produces more evil, than anything else connected with such amusements. I would see all these things purified, cleansed, and brought under Christian principles; but I do not think the Church would really fulfil its mission if it frowned down all such things, and expelled them from its society. I think these things would become worse if withdrawn altogether from Christian influence, and the Church, by renouncing its right to regulate and hallow this wide sphere of human life, would lose much of its hold on mankind at large.

Rev. MAYOW W. MAYOW, Rector of Halstead, Kent.

I THINK I can promise you that I shall be the shortest speaker to-day, because I have only one thought to put before you, on a matter which seems to me especially to demand a word of notice. It has been said by one of the speakers, that what hinders hundreds of clergymen from taking such steps as they might do towards purifying things which need purification, and improving things which need improvement, is a sense of responsibility, and a fear lest their words and actions should be misjudged. That is perfectly true; and many clergymen leave undone the good that they might do for fear of some evil that may follow. Let the laity help us here. If they see the clergy do some things they would not do, let them believe our motives and intentions are honest and upright. Let them not judge the clergyman harshly or with censoriousness, merely because he does, or gives his approval to, some things which do not fall in with their previous ideas, or, perhaps I may say, prejudices. If they will do this concerning popular literature and amusements, we shall at least have gained one good thing by this discussion. Let them always remember the words and the spirit of St. Paul (surely applicable here):—"Let not him that useth not (recreations) judge him that useth them, nor he that useth them judge him that useth them not."

The Rt. Rev. J. J. FRASER, D.D., Lord Bishop of Manchester.

MY LORD ARCHBISHOP—I should not have obtruded myself on the attention of this great meeting if it had not been for your grace's special request. I hope, though I am not always fortunate in realising my hope, I shall not say anything unduly to excite, certainly nothing, I trust, to irritate, the feeling of anybody present. I need not say that I feel the very profoundest interest in this great social question, which has been agitated amongst us this morning. The way in which the question has been discussed; the temper of almost every writer and speaker, and the temper in which all that has been said or written has been received by this assemblage, has been to me a great refreshment. It has been almost like the sensation of a breezy day by the seaside, which I do not get quite so often as I would wish to do. I mean that our Christianity this morning seems to have become more human and more reasonable. I hold that these are the only conditions on which Christianity can put itself forth as a working power in the world. I do thank, from my very heart, Mr. Brownlow Maitland for his admirable paper on the great fundamental principles by which this subject should be approached. He did, it is true, nothing more than expand those great words of the Apostle Paul in which he tells us "All things are ours, things present as well as things to come, life as well as death, heaven and the world." And we are now living in the world. Although I should be the last to recommend that Christianity should take for its standard the standard of the world, still Christianity and the Church must recognise the phenomena and the actual instincts and appetites of the human beings with whom it has to deal. Though, again, I should be the last to deny—nay, in faithfulness to my own Church I could not deny—the principle of the depravity of human nature, still, to prevent me from sinking wholly into despair, and letting my hands go down, helplessly and hopelessly, by my side, I rejoice to believe—and I do not recognise that either my Bible or my Articles require me to modify that belief—that the mark of the divine image in which I was made and in which man was made is still more deeply impressed upon human nature than the mark of the beast, and that that human nature does not naturally and instinctively prefer what is gross and vicious to what is pure and good. I shall confine myself as briefly as I can to some of the topics that have been brought before us to-day. I confess that for the moment my breath was almost taken from me by that somewhat tremendous utterance which fell from one of the speakers, who told us that he felt that either the theatre must be abandoned or Christ must be lost. But Mr. Brownlow Maitland added the necessary apexegesis when he told us that every man must look at the question from his own point of view, and judge himself by what he felt to be necessary for his own spiritual constitution. I felt relieved, and I recognised gladly the truth that we are not to judge one another. And though no doubt there is a danger to us all of adopting and acting upon a low standard of life, particularly in our relations to society; and though all of us are guilty of lamentable inconsistencies on this score, and are sometimes very different in the pulpit and the platform from what we are in the drawing-room, the billiard-room, and other places of social resort, still I could not quite endorse that sentiment as it fell from the speaker's lips in its unqualified, trenchant form, that the theatre must be abandoned or Christ must be lost. Allusion has been made once or twice, and always kindly, to the part I took, not altogether voluntarily, in connection with the theatre during the time of the Manchester Mission which was held in the beginning of 1877. That part was not of my own seeking; but when the Secretary of the Manchester Mission said, "We have been thinking there is a

body of people in Manchester who ought not to be entirely left out of consideration, and those are the people engaged in our theatres,—will you come and address them?”—I felt that an appeal was made to me which I had no right to refuse. Well, I have the courage sometimes of my own opinions, but more frequently I have the courage of my impulses, and when my impulses told me that the thing was a right thing to do, and that if I could bring in any form the message of the gospel to these people, who perhaps do not always hear or do not always have it presented to them in an attractive form, it was my duty as the bishop of the diocese to go. And I must say I was never more amply rewarded. I have on the walls of my drawing-room a work of art of considerable merit that was sent to me by the principal scene painter of one of the theatres—a water-colour drawing of Manchester Cathedral—as a mark of gratitude to me for the sympathy extended towards his class. As I was leaving the stage of the Theatre Royal—for I had to speak from the stage—the stage-manager came to me and clasped me by the hand and said, “Bishop, I thank you for what you have said. You have spoken of us kindly; and if more of you clergy would speak of us poor players kindly and think of us a little more justly than you do, perhaps we should be better than we are.” A clergyman working in a poor parish in London wrote to me a few days later to say I had given some little grain of comfort to a *premiere danseuse* at the Theatre Royal, Manchester, and that it had helped her to struggle through her duty—I was going to say more manfully—but I will say more as a true woman should. He told me of the whole life of this woman—that she was supporting an aged mother and a crippled sister out of her earnings. I could not tell you all my experience on this subject within the time at my disposal, but there are one or two points I wish to bring before you.

The Most Rev. the PRESIDENT.

WE have a little time to spare.

The BISHOP of MANCHESTER.

WELL, there are one or two points of a practical kind—for I think all the principles of the matter have been pretty nearly exhausted—which I should like to touch upon, though they have been incidentally alluded to already. But as these perhaps will be the last words of this meeting, I wish that they may be on the side of what I consider to be the true view of this question. Allusion I think was made in Mr. Bullock's excellent paper—I heard it somewhat indistinctly—to the Ober-Ammergau passion play, or to dramatic representations of that kind. With this Ober-Ammergau passion play, when it becomes the centre of attraction to tastes and natures jaded by the London season, and resorting thither in search of some new sensation, I have nothing to say. But on the other hand, I want you to remember the simple habits of these Bavarian people; and I believe it is to them—I do not say it would be the same to us—but to them, simple peasants living in the mountain valleys, to them that dramatic representation was helpful to form something like real conceptions of the great historical mystery which it attempted to portray. Then, again, I would say that the stage with us is very much what we make it. In that excellent speech—in every syllable of which I concur—which we heard from Mr. William Smith, he said what the stage is—it practically came to that—what the stage is depends on what society wills that it should be. I had a discussion not very long ago with one of the leading directors of the limited company which holds our two principal Manchester theatres. I was speaking to him, as I have spoken to the public, on the grave responsibility that managers of a great theatre incur in putting before the public pieces of the character of the “Pink Dominos,” which has been, I believe, denounced by every respectable journal in

the kingdom as a grave offence to morality, but is still represented, and is attended by thousands, and hundreds of thousands. Well, what was his answer? He said:—"The people will have it. Then there is another point of view, it is so much cheaper to put on the stage." I said, "Give them a play of Shakespeare. When Charles Calvert put those plays on the stage of the theatre in this city thousands flocked to see them." "Yes," he replied, "but it did not pay; it costs £3,000 to put such a play on the stage as Henry VIII. or Henry V., and were it not for the Christmas pantomime we could not in fact make it pay. The public demand a spectacle, and therefore it becomes a very expensive matter to put Shakespeare's great dramas on the stage. But," said he, "out of our *repertoire* we can get up the 'Pink Dominos' for £40." So it seems to be in great measure a question of finance; and I do not think that point is always borne in mind as it should be. A lady wrote to me some little time ago on the subject of the pantomime. You will remember that the director stated that but for the remuneration of the pantomime they would not be able to put such plays as Henry V. and Henry VIII. on the stage at all. Now, the lady wrote to me and said, "What am I to do? My children come home at Christmas; they expect some entertainment. I take them to the theatre, as the most natural and the most obvious, to see the pantomime, and they enjoy it; but for the last two or three years the stage managers have introduced into the pantomime a ballet, and," she added, "I am ashamed to sit in my place and allow my daughters to see the ballet." She said, "What would you have me do?" I am afraid I am not very good at advising, and some people would say my advice was quite impracticable, but as far as I recollect my advice was this: "My good friend, if you would only influence your friends, and persuade them to influence all that they can influence, just to stay away from the pantomime for a single week, until that objectionable ballet—if it be objectionable—is withdrawn, I think the evil you complain of would be cured." The reason why these objectionable features exist is this, that we patronise the very things which in our punctilious and professional moods we condemn. It may be true there are many clergymen who would denounce the theatre loudly, and yet have not sufficient influence in their own households to prevent their wives, sons, and daughters from going there. So that what we have to deal with further is the hollowness of society on this matter. The heart of society is not sound on the question. There are platform utterances very different from the practical maxims on which we act. I remember very well in my classical reading that the satirist Juvenal, who lived in the period of the greatest decadence of society at Rome, describes its demoralising influence on some simple-minded provincials coming from some distant part of the empire to Rome, to pass the season there: and there is one memorable line which I shall never forget, in which he describes how, having gone through all the round of dissipation and meretricious attractions which the great capital presented, they go back to their homes:—

"Sic pretextatos referunt Artaxta mores,"

which, put into local English, may be translated, "And thus they bring back to Sheffield the manners of Cremorne." And you, my friends, who represent what may be called, perhaps, the upper stratum of middle-class society in England, are to a great extent responsible for this. Many of you here in Sheffield go to London for what is called the London season; and you have not the slightest scruple in including as many nights at the theatre, in the fortnight or the month that you spend there, as you possibly can. I say then, that you have no right to declaim against the theatre until you have by some definite act of your own tried to amend it. I don't believe that actors or playwrights wish to corrupt the age, but they are obliged by the necessities of their position to conform, more or less, to the demands of the

age. They meet that demand with a supply, and those who create the demand are those who are supplied. Therefore I would just say this: we have perhaps this morning—though I must except Mr. Brownlow Maitland's speech—been too ready to assume that it is a functional disease that we have to deal with. It is not functional; it is organic. It is not a disease of a particular temper, or of a particular instinct of the human mind; but it is that the whole fabric of society at this present moment has a leaven of evil working in it, of which some of us are not perhaps as much aware as we ought to be; and some of us who ought, do not take the wisest steps to prevent its spreading its virus in our midst. It does seem to me that to the womanhood amongst us belongs this great task of purifying the stage. If you mothers will not allow in your homes young men, however attractive in manner they may be, however rich in fortune, however desirable as matches for your marriageable daughters; if you will not allow in your homes and drawing-rooms men whom you, your husbands, or your sons know to be men of corrupt lives—and you, young women, do not allow fashionable men to say to you things that I am told fashionable men do dare to say to presumably modest women—if, I say, you will surround yourselves with that fence which by the blessing and power of God's grace modesty can always surround itself—a power almost illimitable in its influence might be brought to bear on the elevation of society. I don't believe, myself, that the theatre will ever be purified until society has been worthily elevated; and that I hope and trust will be brought about. I hold fully with my Lord Mulgrave, whom I rejoice to know is one of my own clergy, and one of the most earnest and devoted of ministers, and you must not imagine that by his apology—if apology it can be called—for the theatre he was actuated by any love or desire to see the Church brought down to the level of the world—but I do hope and trust that that appeal which he made to the masses, and especially to the leaders of society, to see to it that in all they are doing to encourage them, they throw their influence on the side of virtue—I trust, I say, this appeal will not have been made in vain. There is no doubt about it that the tastes of the lower classes are somewhat coarser and less refined than the tastes of the upper ten thousand, yet I do not believe—though it was the utterance of a great man—there was ever a more false, deceiving sentiment uttered than that of Burke, "Vice loses half its evil when it loses all its grossness." Evil, when deprived of all its grossness, becomes much more mischievous, because much more attractive and ensnaring. There is only one more subject on which I shall speak, and that is the subject of literature. No doubt there is much in the prevailing literature that is to be deprecated; but I thank Mr. Harry Jones for having brought us back to realities, and for permitting us to believe that the class of people among whom he lives, and among whom I have seen with my own eyes how he lives, and what he is doing to improve their lives—I do rejoice to know that even there things are not so bad as they seem to be, or as they are sometimes thought to be. I remember once I had to preach in the Abbey of Westminster. It was the Sunday after the death of Charles Dickens, and I could not let the opportunity pass without saying what was on my mind with respect to that great writer. I remembered that a leading article which appeared in the *Times* had spoken of him as "the apostle of the people." I believe he was, in a true sense, an apostle of the people. I have read most of Mr. Charles Dickens's works, and so far as I remember there is not one single page, hardly one single sentence, tainted with impurity, or anything that would suggest a vile or vicious thought. I believe that that literature of which he was the author has been pregnant with consequences of incalculable benefit to our people. It has made us see simple virtues under rugged exteriors; it has taught people the joys and the blessedness of pure and innocent homes; it has taught them the great lessons of Christian sympathy; and, though in all things Charles Dickens was not what we might have desired, or what he might have been, we are not

his judges, we do not know the circumstances of trial in which his life was passed. I feel that England owes a debt of gratitude to her great novelist for what he has done to elevate and to purify the human life where it most needs elevation and purification. If we would only endeavour, each one in his own sphere, and each one within the range of his own influence, to make human life purer—and I am quite certain that purity of life is the only condition of true happiness—I think far better than all the speeches or papers read or delivered on this platform, however eloquent, earnest, or true, will be that blessed influence that you will carry back to your own homes, determining that within the range of that influence, society, so far as you can keep it, shall be purer, higher, and worthier.

The Right Rev. Bishop RYAN, Vicar of Bradford.

I WILL only detain the Congress two or three minutes. With reference to bad books I think the clergy ought to be more persistent in their warnings against them. If this were especially done when preparing candidates for confirmation it would have a greater effect and do a great deal of good. I quite agree with Mr. Harry Jones that we should make it our business to find out what sort of literature our people require, and do our best to guide their tastes into healthy channels. With regard to theatres, I hope it will go forth from this hall that while all acknowledge how much there is which is noble and elevating in the drama, we feel how imperative is the need of improvement in the management of theatrical representations before Christian men and women can be asked to take their children and young people to the theatre as it now is—unreformed. As to the “narrow party” described by Mr. Maitland, I hope when he speaks of them in that way he will caricature them as he has done today, and his picture will then do no harm. Instead, however, of caricaturing the Quakers, it should be always recollected what they have done to benefit the world. Who did more to knock the fetters from the limbs of the slave? And as to the narrow party in the Church, out of which he tells us he has come,—are they not sending forth men to spend and be spent in doing good among different tribes and nations of the earth? Instead of fencing themselves in, they are making openings on all sides, through which they have gone, and are going, to the ends of the world, to spread the blessings of the gospel of Christ.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 3rd, 1878.

The Right Hon. and Most Rev. the PRESIDENT took the Chair at 2.30.

WOMAN'S WORK IN THE CHURCH.

PAPERS.

The Most Rev. the PRESIDENT.

I AM very sorry to say that Miss Whately is not present, having left this country a few days ago. Her paper, however, is on the table, and will be read by Mr. Wright, one of the secretaries of this Congress.

The Right Rev. Dr. BEDELL, Bishop of Ohio, U.S.A.

No one thinks of questioning in these days, the rightness of "Woman's Work." It has become a recognised instrument and is a most attractive feature in modern movements, whether in the general cause of humanity, or the advancement of the Church of Christ. Some very powerful forces are included under the term. The garden of the Lord, everywhere, now feels the imprint of woman's feet, the busyness of her hands, the intelligence of her thought, and the love towards Christ that breathes in every motion.

Therefore my task is simplified: no argument is needed. The more pleasant duty of illustration is that which I understand to be confided to me. And as part of that illustration, there will be added some information concerning "Woman's Work" in the United States of America.

I am to speak of Christian Women's Work. There is a curious history, as yet unwritten except by the angels, of woman's influence in the progressive development of the Church of Christ. Part of that history has indeed been written on the pages which tell of glorious martyrdoms and deeds of heroic daring. But that part of the story is still unwritten which could tell of the mightier victories of love, and the more enduring triumphs of domestic opportunity, through all these past Christian ages; the far-reaching successes of Christian tact, the immortal conquests for Christ that have been won by the seizure of right moments within the privacy of home. How many a man of toil, and of mark, has been formed by the patient culture of home. How many statesmen who have shaped the Christian ages; how many heroes who have guided the Church's conquests; how many saints who have illustrated religion, since the day when the first Bishop of Ephesus was fitted to the hands of Paul by his grandmother Lois and his mother Eunice; have owed their strength to a mother's conquest of an insubordinate spirit, to a mother's precepts of wisdom, to a mother's or a sister's piety. St. Augustine's unwilling submission to Christ, the result of the teaching and the answer to the prayers of the not less saintly

Monica, was only the most illustrious of the innumerable instances of a mother's work. Public deeds are written in the history of time. Private victories for Christ are written in God's history of eternity. Perhaps we shall find, when we shall have entered on the eternal life, that these were more enduring and more really influential than those, as we shall certainly find that they have occupied a larger space in the angel's record. And so it may be, after all, that woman's work is writing the largest part of Christian history.

But the subject for particular study this afternoon leads aside from private and domestic life, to less retired and more demonstrative labours of Christian women in the cause of humanity. Nor is it singular that the providence of God has chosen women for his instruments in many of the crises of Christian history, when we consider the wealth of power latent in their nature, their firmness of principle, decision, tact, the depth of sympathy, which they exhibit when either is needed. I refer only to salient points in the history of your own nation and Church.

Nearly 1800 years ago (as I read tradition), woman's work introduced Christ's gospel into Britain. For Eigen, the granddaughter of Brennus, brave but unfortunate leader of the Britons, was carried captive with him to Rome in the 1st century. Both of them learned of Christianity, and embraced it, during their captivity. When they returned, it was her sweet presentation of the love of Christ, more influential than his authority, which spread the tidings of the then new story of the cross.

Then again, when the ancient British Church had been almost crushed by reviving paganism, and the time had come when a fresh infusion of the faith was needed to reinforce the dying life, and new blood of the pure gospel was to be poured through the old arteries, it was Bertha, the daughter of Charibert, king of Paris, whom the Lord selected as his missionary. Your Ethelbert of Kent demanded her in marriage. But this Christian maiden would not leave her home, until the British chieftain had promised that she should have a Church at Canterbury, and enjoy without hindrance the services of her own ministers of God. And history ascribes to Bertha's loving ministrations of the faith in Christ Jesus, the conversion of her husband Ethelbert; which was followed by the less gentle conversion and baptism of 10,000 of his Saxon subjects.

So again, at the Reformation, England would have lost all that Edward VI. had gained for Protestant Christianity, had it not been for the reign of Queen Elizabeth. So again, after many revolutions, the Church of England to-day has cause to bless God for the bounties of good Queen Anne.

And once again, in this age, England was feeling the influence of social upheavings in France. Domestic life, the very bulwark of England's strength, was threatened. Almost unconsciously to herself, these new foreign social falsehoods were assailing the purity and peace that had dwelt so securely within the safeguards of England's homes. Then God placed upon the throne a Christian wife and mother, model for the world of all womanly graces and

domestic virtues. And thus in an age that was learning to think lightly of the sanctities of family life, not England alone, but all who speak the English tongue, and all who are to the English "manner born," received from Her Majesty Queen Victoria, and Prince Albert her noble consort, the idea of home, restored to its purity, sanctified by religion, and illumined by undying love. Very instructive is this interweaving of woman's work with the history of our Church, at its great crisis, from the earliest moments of its introduction into Britain, for the present awakening and the general interest of this subject are in direct harmony with this line of providences. We are living at another critical era—the missionary era of the Church of Christ, when by every process the gospel progresses, not only directly by preaching, but directly by teaching, and indirectly by its manifold ameliorations of human woes. At such an era it was to have been expected that the ministration of Christian women, in their appropriate sphere, would become a characteristic of the age.

No one stays now to plead for the admission of woman's work among acknowledged instrumentalities for advancing the gospel, and healing the wounds of humanity. Florence Nightingale, the Misses Marsh and Wightman, Mrs. Welsh, Miss Whately, these workers have settled that question. They, and others who have emulated or assisted them, both in your Church and in ours, as well as in earnest Christian communities around us, have asserted for woman's work a position of honour and a distinct sphere which it can never lose again.

Thus far, certain well-marked principles have guided the most successful women workers; and we may take it for granted that these should be received as distinctive—the principles which should continue to govern in this department of Christian effort.

1. "Woman's Work" is that which is suited to her sex. The statement may be a truism in England. I trust so; for it is evident that as soon as a woman, however skilful or energetic, undertakes man's work, she steps out of her sphere. It is not a question of capability; for both history and the experience of our own age have taught that there is no limit to the capability of women when a necessity arises. But it is a question of providential arrangement. And at that point we leave this truism.

2. The next ruling principle is closely allied to the former. "Woman's Work" does not disturb the sanctities of home, nor ever strain a proper modesty and reserve. This truth also seems to be self-evident. And I would not keep it before your minds, except that it may appear to involve the propriety of sisterhoods. It certainly does exclude that class of communities of women which is trammelled by vows of perpetual obligation. But sisterhoods when rightly ordered, and Deaconesses, present only another form of home life, and do not dissolve the family bond which is ordained of God; and by their peculiar methods secure it that no strain is given to womanly modesty and reserve. Nevertheless, so far as my reading or experience extends the most happy results of "Woman's Work" in this age have been reached without disturbing the ties or relationships of family life; and their most blessed

influences have arisen from the fact that women, fresh from the amenities of home, and full of domestic affections, have carried the sympathies and awakened the memories of a home, in camp and hospital and school, and among the navvies and mechanics, and in the hovels of the poor. I need only name again Florence Nightingale, the Misses Marsh and Wightman, and Miss Whately, and the point will be established; for these are representatives of the three great classes of woman's humanitarian and Christian effort; that is, the suffering, wounded, and sick; the destitute and poor; and the ignorant. And in each case, these noble women, fresh from the sweetness of home life, have carried with them its fragrance and moral beauty as one main element of their power.

It is a point of no small importance that the observance of this principle throws open women's work to thousands of faithful mothers and sisters who would otherwise be excluded. Their first duties are at home. But they can find abundant opportunity to labour for Christ outside of home, and they need not desert their obligations in the family. Naming Miss Whately, I must be allowed to bear witness to the excellence of her work in Cairo, and her happy influence over both Copts and Mahommedans in that city. It is an illustration in point, for she has transferred an English Christian home to Cairo; and when I saw her in the midst of her orphans and her schools in Egypt, she seemed the embodiment of the spirit of sisterliness within a true English household.

To these names I add, from among my own countrywomen, the name of Mrs. Welsh; who, following in the line of Miss Marsh's work, and Miss Wightman's, has ministered for eighteen years to the operatives near her country house, without diminishing an item of her domestic duty; and among hundreds who laboured in the sanitary department, the names of two whom I have personally known, who, following the noble lead of Florence Nightingale, when the necessity arose carried the sweet influences of home into the camp, among the wounded and the dying—Mrs. Canfield, and Mrs. Hayes, the wife of the honoured President of our Republic.

3. The third principle is, that the ruling motive shall be always a true Christian charity, inspired by a devoted love to our Lord and Saviour. No other motive can sustain, can keep pure, can freshen, and perpetually invigorate these self-denying labours.

4. The fourth is a description rather than a principle. Woman's work is such as brings into play her peculiar virtues and strength: sympathy, compassion, gentle ministering, the power of influence by word, by touch, by example; her skill in teaching, tact in discipline and guidance; the reproof of her silent indignation, or, more powerful still, of her grief; the sway of her quiet dignity and grace.

Applying these principles, the sphere of woman's work lies in instruction, both of young and elder persons, in mission schools at home and abroad; discipline and guidance in houses devoted to orphans, or the outcast; care of the sick, wounded, suffering, and infirm, in hospitals, or (what should never be overlooked) in destitute homes in our own immediate neighbourhoods; the rescue of outcasts; devising of hopes for the hopeless; inventing work for

the unemployed; visiting the stranger; reviving the forlorn; in other words, becoming mother, sister, or friend to those who need the special ministries of either, or to those most miserable in the midst of our social happiness—those who have lost them all.

Our Christian women in the United States have made noble use of this new opportunity. I can speak with knowledge only of those who have been working in our own Church; but not less have other churches been illustrated by a continuous line of noble workers since the era when Mrs. Judson led the way in India.

You will pardon me, my Lord Archbishop, if I repeat some names which are household words with us. They will not indicate character, nor have I time to depict it; but I should like you to hear sounds which are dear in the memory of our Church.

Mrs. Payne and Mary Ball, in Africa; Mrs. Boone, in China. These have finished their course. Miss Fay, in China, at the close of her twenty-fifth year of restless activity is greeted by her grateful Chinese scholars with their title of highest honour, as Lady Fay. Miss Muir, in Athens, who has taken up the thread so long and well held by Frederica Mulligan, and as yet scarcely laid down by her sister, our wise, patient, ardent, hopeful, unwearied, Mrs. Hill, who has been a worker there for more than forty years. Miss Baldwin, in Joppa, working (until she went to her rest) in the same line with Miss Whately. One member of our Church is working among the Zenarias, in your own empire in India. In our own country, no sooner was opportunity given, than our Churchwomen entered among the freedmen of the Southern States, carrying education with the gospel, and, with rare bravery meeting the task of elevating these poor blacks to their new position.

Ever since our Government has opened the Indian territories to be civilised by our Christian Churches, by placing the Indians directly under their care, Christian women have been foremost in this venture for their Lord. Miss Pritchard, from my own diocese, is one; gone to the very borders of civilization; familiar now only with red men and their squaws; in her hut, in the midst of their tepis, with a few Indian children around her, endeavouring to exhibit Christian civilization, and to portray the idea of a Christian home. It is the grandest heroism. Talk of the renown of Jael and of Judith; they pin a sleeping hero to the earth with a tent nail or a sword; but these conquer a living savage, who is wide awake, by moral power. It is moral power like that which Guido painted in the eye and the breath of the Archangel Michael, before which even Satan trembled and was prostrate ere the Archangel's sword touched him.

Our Churchwomen have now become an efficient power in gathering funds for missionary and other Church work, and also in stimulating the energies of Churchmen.

That the information now laid before this Congress might be accurate, I have sent to America for documents, and now have the pleasure of placing them on your table. They refer to the work of those who are not associated in sisterhoods.

The Women's Auxiliary to our Board of Missions has become an

integral part of our system. It has its own general secretary, Miss Emery, and organised branches in thirteen dioceses. It helps to support all our missions, domestic and foreign. It sends boxes of clothing, and other necessary articles, to missionaries and scholars. The children, among other gifts, send their toys to the children in our Indian and our freed-men schools. Missionary scholarships are supported. The children of missionaries sent home from foreign stations, are educated. The lives of missionaries are insured. Here are a series of five annual reports. The last shows a total, in cash and other gifts, of 83,000 dols.

The most active branch association is in the diocese of Massachusetts, having organisations in almost every parish; the next, that of Central New York, with 72 parish societies. I lay these reports before you.

The Mexican League is another form of woman's work among us, by which they have undertaken to contribute 20,000 dols. per annum towards the need of the Protestant Episcopal Church, known as the Church of Jesus in Mexico.

I pass now to the other line of woman's work: its ameliorating and instructive power through personal influence.

The most striking example amongst us has been given by Mrs. Welsh and her daughters, at Frankford, a large manufacturing town, close to their country seat, and a suburb of Philadelphia. Nobly seconded by her husband — the grandest specimen of an unselfish and self-consecrated lay worker which our Church has yet produced, and whose sudden death this year the whole Church mourned—Mrs. Welsh has accomplished a miracle of reform in that community.

Her scheme was adapted from hints given in "English Hearts and Hands," and "Haste to the Rescue." An effort which began with a mother's meeting, when two only could be induced to attend, has grown into a grand success by eighteen years of steady work. A community once proverbial for drunkenness has become as remarkable for its sobriety; hundreds of households have become Christian homes; the parish church, which was too large, has become too small, although twice enlarged, and although several services are held on the Lord's Day for successive congregations; its communicants now number more than 1,200; and the attendance at Mrs. Welsh's Sunday Bible-class of men has averaged 80 each Sunday, year by year.

The Congress will find an admirable outline of this class of work in a pamphlet on "The Episcopal Hospital of Philadelphia," "The Bishop Potter Memorial House" for the training of women workers, and "Woman's Spiritual Mission;" and also in the "Memorials of William Welsh," written by Bishop Howe, of Central Pennsylvania, both which I lay on the table.

The sanitary work of our Christian women, in our late civil contest, suggested by Florence Nightingale's disinterested labours, has been made known partially by newspaper reports and official documents. I will not dwell on those acts of heroism.

But within a few days I have received from America an account

of woman's work in Boston, part of which will certainly be novel, and perhaps suggestive. It is not specifically the work of our church, although our churchwomen are associated with it.

Following an idea struck out by the State Charities Aid Association of New York, in which Miss Schuyler has been prominent, three groups of women inspectors appointed by authority, in Massachusetts, visit and report upon the condition of 4,000 paupers, prisoners, and poor children in the public prisons, reformatories, alms-houses, and orphanages.

The novelty to which your special attention is invited is this :— Under the lead of Miss Chickering, a prison has been built for sentenced women ; and all the officers are women, except a steward and a watchman !. In the prison school a woman teaches six classes, for an hour each, daily. In the workshops, kitchen, laundry, and hospital, the women are guided by women to do their work deftly and steadily, and with heart in it. Of the 460 convicts, sixty have children born since they entered the prison. Consequently a nursery has been added.

In this line of influence, bringing Christian women's power directly upon the degraded classes of their sex, what possibilities are opened for women's work in its most beneficent illustration !

All hail, then, to the Christian women who, in this age, have shewn to the Church the latent power that was lying undiscovered and unused within our Christian homes : power which, without taking one step beyond its divinely-consecrated sphere, without disturbing the sanctities of home, or straining modesty and reserve (essential elements of womanly strength), has gone ministering in the houses of poverty, teaching the poor to help themselves, teaching them industry, economy, thrift, neatness, and binding all the rough hearts with the gentleness of Christ ; which has not shrunk from the miseries of the hospital nor the degradation of a prison, nor hesitated before the dangers of the camp or the battle-field ; which has carried the gospel beyond the bounds of civilisation into every land where the missionary spirit has made a way ; which has stirred dull charities among the men of the Church by its quiet example of liberality ; and awakened many a sleeping church by its irresistible appeal of sleepless activity.

My Lord Archbishop, and you my brethren and friends who sympathise in this view of woman's work for Christ and his Church, the allegory is warranted with which I close this paper.

In that lovely epithalamium which Solomon wrote, describing, in Oriental figure, the sympathy between Christ and his Church, occurs this impassioned prayer :—

“ Awake, O north wind ;
And come thou south !
Blow upon my garden,
That the spices thereof may flow out ! ”

It is the gentle voice of the bride. She is waiting, but not idly, for the coming of her Lord. When the morning shall break, and the shadows flee away, He is coming to visit his garden. But she

has been busy before the dawn, and now is working hopefully in the grey twilight of his approaching advent; and even now, although unseen by her, He is, in spirit, walking delighted through these new fields of labour which His bride has opened. He sees the new plants which are springing from her hand: He accepts the new fruit which is ripening at her touch: He breathes the new perfume of loving charity, that loads the air at the impulse of her Christian ingenuity. We hear Him speaking of His bride, "She hath done what she could;" and every word of such a spouse is laden with a blessing, and every word is crowded with a promise.

And then upon the dawning day, it is the merry morning song of the bride that I hear—the woman-worker for Christ; her fittest representative—the song of the bride that I hear, as she is still working, still waiting, still watching, half carol and half prayer, working while she prays, and praying whilst she sings—

"Awake, O north wind;
And come thou south!
Blow upon my garden,
That the spices thereof may flow out!"
For my beloved and my Lord.

The Rev. C. SISUM WRIGHT then read the following paper by
Miss WHATELY.

THE subject of Woman's Work in the Church is one so large and so many-sided, that all I can venture to attempt is to offer a few suggestions which have occurred to me, and which those better qualified may be able to follow up more effectively.

The analogy between the life of a family and that of a Christian community would lead us to infer, that as woman was appointed the "helpmeet" of man in the one, so she is in the other; each party supplementing the other, and filling up what is left defective: so that a work carried on by one side alone without the aid of the other would generally be found wanting in some essential features of completeness.

And experience seems to show that this is the case in most instances.

Again, as to the province of woman as a worker—to define it by a hard and fast measuring line, as we map out the boundary of a territory, would be impossible; but perhaps we may indicate the direction in which we may look—not exclusively nor solely, but specially and principally—to determine woman's province of action.

In all Christian work there must be an outer and an inner side: the care for souls, the seeking to bring all to Christ, can never be safely severed, in practice, from a regard for the outward and material welfare of those we try to teach or influence. The two objects are not to be confounded together, but they must, in most cases, be taken jointly. Whenever they are arbitrarily separated we find that the spiritual work becomes visionary and unpractical, and the temporal and secular, worldly. Now the province most specially fitted

for woman in the Christian Church seems to be, if we may so express it, the *frontier* ground, on which these two great objects, the temporal and spiritual welfare of others, meet.

If we call to mind the instances in our own day where woman's work has been most signally blessed, we shall find that a great majority may be referred to this class. We need only allude to the honoured names of those who have done so much to promote the welfare of our navvies, soldiers, sailors, &c., the founders of coffee-rooms and workmen's halls, of refuges and asylums of every kind, to see how in all these labours of love, efforts for the soul and body are linked together.

In specifying more minutely, we may name first, the instruction of the ignorant, and particularly of children. It is well known that the very young are generally reached by a woman more successfully than by a man.

Among those past childhood, the teaching of women and girls must naturally take the first place: but there are some who seem gifted with a special power of influencing boys and growing lads, and men of the working class. And the existence of such a power would seem to be an indication in most instances of God's guidance in that direction.

Efforts for the aid of those young women who are under the necessity of working for their own support, especially those employed in shops and factories, who often need the wise and tender counsel of one of their own sex more than almost any other class, must form a very important part of woman's work in the Church. No less important is the work among discharged female prisoners and the fallen; those whom a helping hand may yet raise up and lead into the right path, and who, for want of it, may sink lower still.

And it is hardly needful to speak in the case of orphans, of homeless and destitute children, and those who are worse than orphans—the children of criminal parents.

Work among the sick has been ever regarded as the special province of women; but it is one in which we may truly say, "there remaineth yet much land to be possessed." The movement for training educated women as nurses is one which may lead to much good, if rightly directed. If all public institutions had each an educated Christian woman to superintend the nursing department, and watch that it does not become, as it too often does when left to those who work *only* for hire, cold, hard and mechanical—the patients, instead of feeling themselves, as too often they must, merely parts of a vast machine in which no kindly feelings enter, might be cheered by the touch of a loving human hand held out to help them, much avoidable suffering would be removed, and what is unavoidable, mitigated.

We can hardly estimate how many actual abuses often creep into the best managed institutions from the absence of this personal element of kindly, watchful, voluntary superintendence. Surely this may well belong to woman's province.

Medical Missions too should be supplemented by the efforts of Christian women. We need only read a page from the experience of

medical workers among the poor to see how many cases there are in which, unless the harassed and anxious *mind* can be ministered to, and needful comforts supplied for the body, the most skilfully applied remedies can avail but little: and here again we see the missing link which could be supplied by female agency.

The work of Bible Women, and other kindred efforts, are too well known to need special mention, except as another branch, and a most important one, of this department in which temporal and spiritual work go hand in hand.

Of Foreign Mission work we have not yet spoken; and yet the call for female agents, not only in our Indian empire, but in almost every part of the world where missions are established, is greater than it has ever been: and though many have come forward to respond to that call, they are few in comparison to the need of them.

The field for work is indeed a vast one; and many and devoted as are the labourers, they are still but few in comparison with the mass of terrible misery, ignorance, and moral and social degradation to be met and combated.

Still we have a vast amount of what a manufacturer would call "raw material" to work with; material which is power, which might be rendered available if only used rightly and given a right direction.

Never, perhaps, in the world's history has there been a time in which so many women could be found possessed of leisure and in a position to devote the whole or the chief part of their time to work in the Lord's vineyard.

Too many, doubtless, among these have never sought or desired to "occupy" for their Master. Till we have received what He has to give to us we cannot give ourselves to His service. But even among those who desire to work actively for Him, there are multitudes who are kept back by timidity and indecision, and the inertness which is sometimes the result of not seeing the way how to begin or what to set about first. A helping hand to give them "a start" is what they need, and for want of that they remain unemployed.

Others waste their strength on efforts which are unavailing because ill-directed. A spirit of unreasoning imitation will often draw a number of ardent, enthusiastic young persons to follow in the track of one who has been eminently successful in some field of Christian labour, without stopping to enquire if the path that was fitting for *her* is in any way adapted for *them*. They may differ from their model, perhaps, in temperament, education, habits, position, everything but the common faith. Some, it is true, may only have needed the first impulse given to lead them into a sphere for which they *are* fitted; but generally there are many more who enter on the undertaking, not because God has called them, but simply because others have done the same before them.

A work so entered on is like a child's mimic garden of flowers, plucked up and stuck in the ground by their stalks, which will seem for a moment to flourish, but will quickly wither away for lack of root.

Others, again, fail, not because they have mistaken their vocation,

but because they have not the necessary preparation and training for their work. Educational advantages are often unduly slighted by Christian workers. God has indeed honoured the labours of many who did not possess these blessings; but this is no reason why those who do should not use them to the uttermost, and bring all they know to bear on their teaching, their writing, their transacting the business of their charities, in short all that concerns their work for God.

A want of order and method and punctuality often leads to waste of power, and mars a good work; and even those not brought up in such habits might learn them. They would be forced to do so in labouring for an earthly master. Will they do less for a heavenly one? May we not too often apply the cutting words of the prophet to Christian workers, "Offer it now to thy governor; will he be pleased with thee, or accept thy person?"

Again, the want of clear, sound methodical scriptural training is a hindrance which practically cripples the efforts of many who might do good service. The blessing of regular Sunday instruction is often confined to the children of the poorer classes, while those who are in a position to be helpers of others have been accustomed to a vague desultory way of reading the Bible which leaves them perfectly helpless in meeting the attacks of Rationalism on the one side or Romanizing doctrine on the other. "The sword of the Spirit" is in their hands, but they know not how to use it; like the recruits of Bourbaki's army in the Franco-German war, they have gone into the battle without accoutrements or knowledge of the use of arms. They have to meet a wary, unsleeping foe, ever on the watch to attack them. Who can wonder if they fail?

Many again who are really qualified to be useful in certain departments are deficient in the power of seeing what they are fitted for. Without some regard to the difference of temperament, capacity, previous training and habits, and physical and mental power, it is impossible rightly to employ the talent or talents God has given us. Yet this is too often overlooked. We persist in taking a pick-axe to supply the place of a sculptor's chisel, and a finely tempered blade to do the work of a rough saw; and then we wonder at our failures. The wonder is they are not greater and more momentous than they are.

But now comes the question, — How to keep clear of such mistakes? How to bring the worker, and the right kind of work for her, into relation with each other?

And here we may naturally ask whether the agency of institutions for associated female workers, such as Deaconess Homes, and the like, would not fill up the gap; but in discussing this point we come upon much-disputed ground.

On the one hand, these agencies are in many ways less easily adapted to English than to continental life; and when applied to our own country they require considerable modification.

Again, those who dread, and justly so, the Romanizing tendency in many of the societies termed "sisterhoods" in this country are

tempted sometimes to go further still, and fear anything which can be supposed to approximate in outward form to such things.

To weigh the question rightly we must allow for the difficulties these circumstances present.

And to those persons whose character inclines them to independent and comparatively isolated work (and this description comprises many admirable and successful workers) the danger in this case will seem to outweigh the possible good, because they will not see the need of the kind of agency.

But on the other hand, many who are invaluable workers under direction and guidance find it impossible to stand alone.

And apart from this even, very many women, especially young ones, would be practically set aside from all but desultory and fragmentary labour, without the protection and material assistance of associations of this kind.

There *are* fields of work which cannot be reached by solitary female workers, and departments which are nearly or entirely shut out from those residing in families. In short, a great deal that needs to be done will be left undone if we refuse such help altogether.

But there is in connection with such agencies a danger which needs to be kept constantly in view, and one which is not escaped even where the teaching and management is irreproachable and decidedly Protestant. That danger is the monastic spirit. Wherever we can trace a disposition to view work done in a community as something higher and holier than the same work done elsewhere; wherever there is a tendency, even the slightest, to consider that a woman is more truly working for God in such an association than she would be in the discharge of home and family duties; wherever the life is regarded as a consecrated life *as such*, more than that of other Christians, or quitting it is looked on as abandoning a holy vocation; wherever unquestioning obedience is dwelt on as sacred duty, and the responsibility transferred from the worker to those superintending her; then and there we may be very sure that the leaven of monasticism is beginning to show itself, and if not promptly checked it may lead to all the evils of the conventual system.

Our only safeguard is constant, jealous watchfulness against this danger. This is no reason for shunning all associations of the kind; but it is a reason for sedulous care to keep them pure from the first approaches of the danger, and to beware of many things which may seem harmless in themselves, but which may let in "the thin end of the wedge."

To return to our question, viz.:—How to utilise the working-power in existence, and bring it to bear on the vast field, at home and abroad, waiting to be tilled?

Three things seem principally needed:—

1st. A more generally diffused, accurate, and careful scripture training among educated women.

2nd. Facilities for special training in the habits which would fit a young person for usefulness in the field of Christian labour.

3rd. Increased facilities for bringing those desirous of work, and the work to be done, together.

The two first objects might be met by good training institutions for educated women desirous of employment in the home or foreign mission field ; not institutions in which they should pass their lives, but in which they might have six months, a year, or two years' training, according to the circumstances. The training should in such a case comprise careful and exact Bible teaching carried out by competent persons. Such Bible-classes might be shared in by those not resident, if desired : and they would contribute to prepare what all Sunday-school superintendents know to be sadly needed, a supply of suitable teachers for Sunday-schools and similar agencies.

The students might also be exercised practically in teaching, district visiting, parish work, &c., and in special departments for those who desired it.

Associations of voluntary workers might be more or less intimately connected with these institutions, and they might mutually work together.

The third want would be met in part by such an agency as that just mentioned ; but still more effectively, perhaps, by certain ladies of experience and influence acting as *referees* and registrars of those desirous of finding employment in the mission field at home or abroad, and forming a medium of communication between those wishing for helpers and those willing to help.

Such referees would not only find workers for places needing them, but would enable many who can give but little time or strength, to utilise that little. There are many subordinate departments in which those unable to do more might usefully take a part, and in this way the time and strength of others might be saved ; and the division of labour, as in all other cases, would profit alike the helpers and the helped.

There is room for all in the Lord's vineyard. And those whose first duties lie at home need not think they are working less truly for God there than their sisters in the school, the district, or the mothers' meeting. For the Christian woman, her home claims must come first ; and the work which would lead her to forsake these, however noble in itself, is not, she may be assured, God's work for *her*. But for those employed busily in their own families there are often fragments of time and power which they may rejoice in being able to give to that wider mission field to which they cannot devote, like others, the main and chief part of their lives.

Such influential referees and general counsellors as have been spoken of would help Christian women in this, the *normal* position of woman, to employ these fragments from their home life, and thus draw all into nearer and more friendly mutual communication.

And while thus raising up a body of trained and educated female workers, we may be sure that the openings for them would multiply. Often the incompetence or want of judgment displayed by a well-intentioned and pious woman will not only close the door of usefulness against herself, but against others after her. And we may be sure, if we could multiply our staff tenfold, there would still be more to do than we could ever fully overtake.

But above all, our strength lies in union ; not in uniformity, which

many mistake for it, and which is a very different thing: not in ignoring or concealing differences of opinion, nor in crushing and checking free action, but in encouraging a cordial, free, and affectionate intercourse between Christian workers as such; each seeking not to exalt herself or her own department, but to help on others, and to "be of one mind in the Lord." Then indeed is the Christian woman truly consecrated to her Master's service, not by vows or outward badges, but by daily offering up herself as a living sacrifice to the Master Who has not only redeemed her from sin and death, but raised her to her true position, that of being of the number of those whom He was pleased to call "his sister and his mother" because they do his will.

Rev. FRANCIS PIGOU, D.D., Vicar of Halifax, Chaplain in
Ordinary to the Queen.

WE may safely assume that they who assemble on such occasions as the present are not only healthily and actively interested in questions affecting the welfare, stability, resources, and extended usefulness of the Church of Christ, and have His cause warmly at heart, but that all are of one mind in the earnest conviction that God has created us for His glory, and that to few, if indeed any, save such as are bereft of reason, is denied some opportunity of serving Him. Of each of us it may be said, "The Lord hath need of thee." Gifts and aptitudes may vary in ability and scope, but all are capable of consecration. Flowers and fruits are of varied fragrance and flavour, yet does not each fruit and flower answer the end of its creation? Birds not gifted with song have brilliant plumage, while some of the sweetest songsters are of sober and unattractive hue. Stars in space and glittering fire-flies; trees of tropical stature and moss on ruins; huge rocks from which alluvial soils are formed and microscopic shells in the ooze of the sea; waving palms and slime in pools—each and all have their work and place. Waste of power and disuse of material are unknown in the domain of physics and the realm of nature. It is the practical lesson most frequently insisted upon in the Word of God, that "we are not our own but are bought with a price," that every redeemed life has by redemption passed into the possession of Christ, and that that life is only then lived truly and well in so far as it is consciously and definitely consecrated to God. That is our starting point. And if this position be true, there must also be some work for each and all within the sphere of Christ's kingdom:

"In God's great field of labour
All work is not the same;
He hath a service for each one
Who loves his holy name."

To dwell on facts on all hands allowed, were needlessly to occupy our time. All well know the sin and want which unhappily abound. The

statesman, philanthropist, clergyman, all who are ever seeking to solve great social problems or remedy great social evils, are daily confronted with the havoc sin has made and is making in our fallen world. But, on the other hand, the world is God's great field in which He would have us be not loiterers but labourers. "Sir, go work in my vineyard," is the Master's bidding. Is it so, or is it not so, that our present machinery, limited and restricted in theory, fettered by conventionalism, impeded by prejudice, is unequal to grapple and cope with the sin, unbelief, and degradation of our day? Well may the clergy and their handful of helpers say, "What are we among so many?" Well may some faithlessly lose heart in apparently fruitless toil, or, toiling beyond their strength, sink into an early grave! Are we availing ourselves in the diocese or parish of *all* our available help? Have we taxed to the utmost the resources of willing hearts? Is there no rich vein left in the mine? Is there not some precious ore still unquarried? If, instead of laments, and fruitless sighing and wringing of hands, we set earnestly to work and enquired if all material is being used in God's service as it might be used, would it not be more practical? In the presence of so much to appal and sadden, as well as so much to gladden and encourage, is not the time come when we, who are fully alive to the spiritual wants of our day, should be ready to put aside prejudice, if prejudice have hitherto stood in the way of our recognition of the work which women are so qualified by nature, when sanctified by grace, to do? Ought we not to be more of one mind in endeavouring to bring it about—that a power not used to the extent it might be used, should not only be recognised, but welcomed, encouraged, organized and used? There should no more be waste in the spiritual than there is in the natural world. And yet how much power for God and for good; how much Christian influence, is lying dormant, is being lost irrevocably to the Church of Christ; not, I earnestly believe, because it is *withheld*, but in too many cases because it is not sought; not from *want of will*, but far more often from *want of opportunity*! It is, I am persuaded, to do many a woman a great wrong to suppose that she would not be glad and thankful to be actively interested in her Redeemer's blessed service. I do not enlarge, tempting as is the theme, on what woman, seen in her happiest aspect, has been divinely endowed with; nor on those peculiar qualities and feminine gifts which, when consecrated to the highest of all purposes, are a real, penetrating, and in some cases resistless power for good. The pastor blessed with a godly wife as his never-failing help; the unmarried curate with his devoted sister; the layman united to one who exercises an influence fraught with blessing to his family and household: such as these well know of what woman, under God, is capable. And yet these represent but a tithe and fraction of the many who would be equally blessed to others were their energies directed into definite channels of usefulness, and were that enlisted into the standing army of disciplined and organised workers, which because not recognized is apt to become desultory. Women are considerably in excess of men; and how many are living aimless, purposeless, if not wasted lives?

No use is being made of them. They have time at their command. The real difficulty is how to get through a day not filled up with blessed toil, if they do not lavish and dissipate their affections on domestic pets; if the work of fiction be not beguiling heavy hours; if time be not distributed listlessly over meals, calls, and dressing, or taken up with domestic cares. Yet with how many is the sacred trust of priceless hours but little realised! The life which wherever it moved might be casting its healing shadow, is hid under a bushel, and not set upon a candlestick. It is trifled away in nameless frivolities, so that when it all comes to an end, if they do not say it, yet the verdict that such pass on their ended life is the sad and sorrowful of her unhappy conviction, who ere she breathed her last, and the spirit returned to the God who gave it, said this to me—"I look back on my life, now near its end, and my bitter reflection on my death-bed is, that I have never, throughout it all, done or said anything for Christ!" It is a serious and saddening consideration, how many women in our land have either, no sense of their responsibility, or excuse inactivity on the ground that they feel no call to spiritual or semi-spiritual work, forgetting that where there is the will God always points the way; or else they too frequently, and not without truth, urge in justification of an apparently aimless life:—"No man hath hired us." Allow a large margin for those whose first work lies at home, whose best "mothers' meeting" is their own nursery, and best "bible class" their own children, whose domestic duties done in a sanctified spirit are of the nature of true religion. Yet how many there are who have no such ties in life as to exclude them from devoting themselves to the more familiar phases of Church work. I, for one, would be loth to encourage the idea that amidst domestic duties, however imperative, no place at all should be found for *some* work, however little, that is definitely undertaken for Christ. But our thoughts naturally turn to widows who are "widows indeed," to the unmarried who are living comparatively solitary lives, to grown-up daughters in a large family, and to the many who find life insipid for want of healthy interest. I set before me those, and within my knowledge they are not a few, who know little or nothing of the happiness that comes with making others happy, little or nothing of that which gives life its zest and value, little or nothing of the tonic of healthy work, and of the safeguard work provides against the manifold temptations of an unoccupied life. The name of such is simply "Legion." Look, on the other hand, at the *opportunities* which are in our stirring time being opened up which women might use—opportunities in which we may safely discern the energizing movement and inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Take first the opportunity for those who are free to go where they please, and who live a comparatively unburdened life. What invaluable help might such render abroad, working in the diocese of a colonial bishop, acting under his immediate direction, strengthening his hands in his arduous, self-denying, and trying work! We know that there are not a few who have thus separated and consecrated themselves, and

found in a colonial diocese varied scope for varied gifts. Take the Zenana Mission; what a field is there white to the harvest of Christian influence! Or if we turn to our wants at home, how many and varied are the opportunities of usefulness which sisterhoods and deaconesses' institutions have been so largely instrumental in developing. I say sisterhoods and deaconesses' institutions, because, provided the great motive from which work is taken up be the constraining love of Christ—the only motive in which we have a safeguard against the subtle idea of merit, and in which alone lies the secret of not being weary in well doing—you must surely not override the religious instincts or preferences of those devoted women who may feel called to enter a sisterhood, with its vow, any more than you would not heartily accept the services of a devoted woman who prefers to work, free at any hour to relinquish her work. We cannot expect all to work any more than we expect all to think in the same groove. Leaving, however, this, as I cannot but think it might be left, without prejudice to the great subject before us, look at some of the doors of usefulness open in our day to women! Shall I speak of the familiar and valued help of a good *district visitor*? How many more women of culture and leisure might take up this work, and find time—yes, consistently with domestic duties—to bring their influence to bear on the poor! How great the gain in our *Sunday schools*, when the children of the humbler classes are brought into close and endearing contact with one of gentle birth and Christian mind! Is not a *mothers meeting* a golden opportunity for good? What shall I say of *sewing classes* for girls; classes for employes in mills and factories; classes for young men and women in our shops; classes for servants; classes for the aged? There is untold power for good in a well-conducted, devotional *Bible-class*. We might have a superior kind of Bible-woman. Some women are particularly gifted in dealing with rough men and uncouth lads. In such there is abundant scope in a class formed out of the husbands, sons, brothers of those who attend our mothers' meetings; or out of the loungers at the corners of streets, wherever, in fact, the waifs and strays of humanity may be found, in lodging-houses and the bye-paths of erring life. A *friendly girls' or friendly young men's society* is an opportunity for evincing kindly interest in, and helping, the comparatively friendless. The day may come when women of refinement and good education will not be averse to the splendid sphere of usefulness which the *mistress of a national school* enjoys, thus helping insensibly to mould the minds of many who are not insensible to the quiet influence of a Christian gentlewoman. If she be physically equal to the arduous, but, oh! that blessed work of *nursing*, she has, after due training, no lack of opportunity in our hospitals and infirmaries. We know the revolution that has been brought about in our hospitals by their ministry who are so specially qualified for nursing:

“When pain and anguish wring the brow
A ministering angel thou!”

What scope for women in reclaiming drunkards, and by forming

classes for the reclaimed, helping them with loving vigilance to keep their pledge! What scope in prisons and penitentiaries! What scope amongst the fallen of her own sex, if in no Pharisaic spirit of scorn, but in his "Who did not break the bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax," she do her best to persuade an erring sister to turn her feet out of the paths of death. How many now sitting at ease, "careless daughters," if debarred from the more active forms of Church work, or physically unequal to much exertion, might pay an occasional visit to the *workhouse* in the parish, and thus light up the monotony of the wearied life; or start a *flower mission*, and encourage their country friends and wealthy neighbours to send some of the produce of their hot-houses, that should find its way to a languishing bed of sickness! How many with gift of voice, might consecrate it by softly singing a few sweet hymns to those on whose ear music falls with wondrous power of soothing, and thus beguile an hour of loneliness and pain! How many invalids, themselves chained down to a sick-bed or sofa, could find scope for their taste or talent in little devices and drawings which, attached to a bouquet of flowers, shall please the grateful invalid, or some sick child! There is no one of these opportunities of usefulness, making more or less demand on the time, which is not to my knowledge being used elsewhere by many who after a "mission" have been brought to ask "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do," and who before found time hang heavily on their hands.

Opportunities are not wanting. The difficulty too often lies with husbands, and not unfrequently with parents. Many a wife would be doing much more for God, but for her husband's objections. Many a child would be ready to forsake all for Christ, if the parent would give ready consent. Why should not this consent be given? In these days when earnest workers, living witnesses, are so sorely needed, why might not many a parent, who has already dedicated a child to the Lord in baptism, have the yet further happiness of knowing that some one in the family of children is raised up to be a Dorcas or Phœbe? It would be so in many homes if parents realized that they had already dedicated their children to the Lord, and if prayer were more often heard in our Christian homes that God would use us all in this short life more and more to His glory. And why should not the scriptural, primitive, and apostolic order of the deaconess be revived? Why should it not become a distinctly recognised centre in every diocese of spiritual power? The deaconess of scripture has been almost swallowed up in the sisterhood and nunnery of modern days. Revive the order of deaconess, and we should do much towards encouraging and utilizing material we cannot afford to waste. The Church of this country being both episcopal in her discipline and parochial in her machinery, the deaconess would have her proper place, and from such an authorized and hallowed centre, she might be sent with prayer to some populous parish, not to the prejudice, exclusion or disparagement of that help which every pastor should endeavour to find and use in his own parish, but as strictly supplemental to it. Woman's work thus consecrated would, as occasion required, be distributed over a diocese, and

much power for good utilized. May we not earnestly press home on all whose lives are so conditioned that entire devotion to active service for Christ is not possible, that they should not therefore believe or acquiesce in the indolent notion that unless thus set apart by imposition of hands or by secret resolve nothing is left for them to do? Shall not such rather be moved to ask—What may I do? Shall not the lamp of holy zeal be kindled here to burn lightly and powerfully in many parishes from which we have come, and to which we are shortly returning? Shall not some godly resolve be made to take up some work, however humble, which will give the life-wearied a healthy interest in life, the listless some definite employment, to lift them out of the insipidity, frivolousness, and aimlessness which they themselves deplore, and shall we not all ask of God to teach us so to look on the woe and sadness of a lost world as to see that this woe and sadness is the Master's call to work? and that of woman this is true:

“Wherever human hearts
In high or low estate
Waste upon earth—and sense
Hopes that should soon from thence,
Thy work, O! woman doth wait.”

ADDRESSES.

REV. BERDMORE COMPTON, London.

WOMEN's work in the Church may be done either in family life, or in a life of separation from the family.

The latter form, as the more effective, is therefore the pattern of the other—as the Royal Artillery or Rifle Brigade are the pattern of military work to the Volunteers. Penitentiary work, and the systematic nursing of large hospitals, have incontrovertibly demonstrated its superiority. I trust the day is not far distant when the members of religious brotherhoods and sisterhoods will exhibit a similar superiority as teachers in our parochial schools. But I desire to speak rather of the conditions of women's work than of the work itself. Moreover, I must ask you to understand that I do not represent the cause of sisters, as if I were officially connected with the great institution which has its home in the parish of which I am the incumbent.

The work of a Christian in the Church is the outcome of the inner life.

The partaker of the life of Christ goes about doing good, as Christ did, because good works are the fruits which the stem of a good life bears.

To do good you must be good.

To be good, you must be very close to God. And God calls some, with a secret voice, to leave all earthly things to be near Him, as He calls others to be near Him without leaving earthly things. It is because a woman hears the voice of God calling her to do so, that she leaves father and mother, and all that she hath, to be near Him. There are, I believe, those who deny that God ever calls a woman to do this—to leave her family to be nearer to God.

He is a bold man who pretends to know what God hath or hath not spoken in the soul of another! It is this call of God to glorify him in a particular way, by a

special witness of renunciation of the world and the flesh, which is the essence of this non-family life.

I am not saying a word against the family life to which you and I are alike called by the voice of God, nor do I at all compare or contrast the holiness to be attained by each kind of life. But I do maintain the reality of a call to some men and women in all ages, "to forsake houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for his Name's sake!" Of course, to be mistaken about such a call, to fancy one hears the voice of God in the heart when God hath not spoken, is a deplorable possibility. My brethren in the ministry need not to be reminded of our own heart-searchings respecting that call of the Holy Ghost, which we solemnly professed to have had when we were admitted to the diaconate.

And admitting the fact of a call of some women, as well as men, to lead a more self-denying life than is possible in a family, I beg you to consider gravely the greatness of the sacrifice. The resignation of family support is a serious thing for a man; it is tenfold more serious for a woman. A person who has not seen something of its trials will hardly believe how serious it is!

I assure you they do grievously need abundant spiritual support.

I doubt whether a life of simple independence from family association, without some substitute for it, is possible for any but very exceptional characters, without serious injury to the spiritual life. Therefore it is that such women do wisely to gather together in communities, which can provide spiritual helps to the attainment of such high spiritual aims.

Even in a community, exceptional spiritual support is needed to maintain a spiritual tone in accordance with the special call of God. A stringent rule of life is the first of these supports. People often talk of a light rule as the easier. It leaves other things pressing on you, far heavier than the heavy rule which casts them off! Moreover, they must have frequent offices of private prayer, of common prayer and praise; frequent sermons or addresses on the spiritual life; frequent draughts of Holy Scripture; frequent Eucharists as the main food of the life of Christ; frequent opportunities of confession, not compulsory but accessible, in proportion as the conscience becomes more sensitive to the hatefulness of sin.

Vows of persistence in obedience to God's voice, not postponed to the age of sixty years, when one would humbly think (with all deference to the Bishop of Lincoln) that, as regards celibacy at least, they are hardly required; not limited to a period of three or five years, a limitation which I have seen to work badly by creating a crisis of spiritual revolution in the soul; but indefinite vows, accompanied by a thoroughly well recognised power of dispensation in the hands of God's chief representative, the bishop of the diocese. All these are great helps, and, in the experience of the Church, have been found necessary helps to the permanent maintenance of this special spiritual life—to the permanent organisation and regulation of the highest type of women's work for God.

One more support is necessary to religious communities of women in the catholic Church. They must be organically connected with the unit of Church organisation, viz., the diocese. They must have the bishop for their real head. They must have true and real episcopal superintendence and protection. This is the panacea for which the whole system is waiting! This is the true solution of the whole question between deaconess communities and sisterhoods.

May we live to see *diocesan* communities of women, called by God to a life of self-renunciation and consequent good works, such as that lately founded by the Bishop of St. Albans, at Great Maplestead; such as those under the care of several of the bishops of the American dioceses, who are in so many respects patterns for the imitation of our own branch of the Holy Catholic Church. But true and real episcopal superintendence has three indispensable conditions of reality—1st. The

bishop must give his energetic support when the community is weak and struggling and unpopular, not delay it until it has established itself without him. 2ndly. The bishop must give considerable personal attention to the community. A deputy bishop is not the same thing as the diocesan; still less a deputy priest. The Bishop of Albany himself acts as chaplain to his sisterhood during six months of the year. In these days, no man can have influence in an institution unless he attends to it constantly.

Of course, it will be said that this is impossible in the present position of our English bishops.

If so, I can only say that the fact of the bishop having more important matter to attend to, does not compensate the community which is neglected for the loss of the episcopal support, and its consequent independence of, and even isolation from, the diocesan system.

Nothing can be conceived more unsatisfactory than for a bishop to be called in, as a *deus ex machina*, to settle an intricate dispute between the chaplain, the superior, and a novice; having no knowledge of his own upon the matter, or any special personal influence on any of the three!

And this leads to the other and concluding requisite for the effective superintendence of a bishop, viz., that he should know something about the matter.

It is a very special knowledge.

Let no one, in dealing with this form of spiritual life, depend upon that much-abused cloak of ignorance, viz., uninformed common sense. Let no one depend upon what is called knowledge of the world. The effective head of a religious community must have a knowledge, not of worldly life, but of unworldly life; an appreciation of enthusiasm; an experience of sharp, inner, spiritual trials of others. And this knowledge is, I believe, only to be gained in one way—by personally hearing confessions.

Rev. G. W. WELDON, Vicar of St. Saviour's, Chelsea.

It would indeed be difficult to overrate the necessity and the importance of woman's work in the Church, or to exaggerate her zeal, her self-denial and devotion in the cause of religion and philanthropy. Woman's unselfish, uncomplaining endurance of trials and privations in the service of the sick, the wounded, and the poor in the slums and purlieus of crowded cities,—in fever-stricken wards of hospitals,—and amid heart-rending scenes on blood-stained battle-fields,—stand out in the strongest and most beautiful relief on the page of history, as in the living world around us. Such self-abandonment for the good of others is not only a brilliant evidence of the woman's state of mind who undertakes it, but it also conveys a most important lesson to those who are silently observing her. It suggests a useful moral to many an unthinking, idle, pleasure-loving woman, who is hopelessly wasting her best energies on the frivolities of fashion, and fruitlessly expending precious time on the vanities of a passing world. Woman, in a special manner, owes a deep debt of gratitude to her Blessed Redeemer, not only for the sake of the common salvation which, through Him, she inherits equally with all mankind, but also because He first, and He alone of all the world's great reformers, made woman's social position firm and permanent. He raised her out of the degradation of the uncontrolled jurisdiction of man, whereby she had become either the plaything of his caprice or the victim of his displeasure. And, instead of being the helpless slave of his convenience, without redress when wronged, and without natural rights, Christ elevated woman to her natural and lawful position as originally laid down by God, as the companion and the helpmeet for man; and thus for ever established,

upon the holiest and tenderest of all earthly ties, her complete enfranchisement in everything where the fusion and unity of household discipline bears righteous sway. At one stroke Christ revolutionised the laws regarding woman's rights and woman's work, and from that day to this, wherever Christianity proclaims its message of love, there woman finds the charter of her personal freedom. The first outcome, therefore, of her gratitude should be work for Christ, and afterwards as a necessary and inevitable result, work in and for the Church.

Woman's work in the Church may be considered from two points of view:—either in the light of active benevolence or of contemplative devotion. As illustrations of these, two instances may be cited of nursing sisters, who may be regarded as typical representatives of their respective orders. During the Crimean war, in the military hospital at Scutari there were two nursing sisters, one of them a lady of high rank and of noble birth. The recovery of the invalids at one time was retarded by the want of clean linen, and this high-born English lady spent weeks, day after day, through many a toilsome hour, over the prosaic and common-place labours of the wash-tub. Her zeal, and I may add her skill also, gained for her the highest commendation from the medical superintendent, who said of this lady, of whose social rank he knew nothing, that “she was the nurse for the work.” That is an instance of woman's work in the light of practical benevolence. The other sister, also at Scutari, belonged to a sisterhood in which the members are instructed in the somewhat difficult accomplishment of silence, and in the equally important discipline of the custody of the eye. This peculiar order of women are taught to believe that it is a very worldly thing to shake hands with a gentleman, or even to look at him, so that in their efforts to avoid such secular excesses these ladies when in public are reduced to the necessity of walking with their heads bowed down towards the ground. This sister carried this piece of pious affectation with her to the East, and it is hardly necessary to add that her usefulness was thereby considerably impaired. A woman with her head bent down would not prove the most suitable nurse in a hospital, and consequently she was sent home without being put to the trouble of undertaking any hospital duties. Among the reasons given for her unfitness for the work, it was stated that a woman who was under a perpetual vow never to raise her eyes from the ground could only be a burden in a military hospital, or indeed any other. Now in contrast with all such absurd and ascetic regulations, we find on examining the Bible, that the holy women there recorded, and who adorned the doctrine of their Blessed Saviour by their self-denying labours, their independent character, and their blameless lives, were not the children of fancy or of mere feeling—the unreal phantoms of romance or fanaticism, but the creatures of God moving amid the hum and bustle of the living tide of human life that flowed around them; letting their light shine in the surrounding darkness, and discharging their duty by meekly bearing their daily cross. Now, in the present age of the Church, we find that piously-disposed young women sometimes join a sisterhood in order thereby to practise a greater self-denial; but I am disposed to think that if they would only stay at home they would find cares and crosses enough in the family circle to discipline any soul. Any young woman who will honestly try the experiment will soon discover that the training and discipline of home government in one's own household will afford ample scope for the production of the saintliest life on earth. To quote the well-known words of the Christian poet—

“The trivial round, the common task
Will furnish all we ought to ask—
Room to deny ourselves; a road
To bring us daily nearer God.”

The ornament of a meek and quiet spirit is nowhere more severely tested than in

one's own family; but there is a shallow notion, and, it is to be feared, somewhat popular among persons of a certain school of religious thought, that religiously and devoutly-disposed young women are doing greater service to God and to the Church by withdrawing from the discipline and training of the home circle, in order to retire into the solitary contemplation provided for them within the walls of a convent. I am unable to conceive how it is possible, in this day, with our Bibles and common sense to guide us, such an idea can be entertained for a moment. There are, nevertheless, eminent divines of a certain school in the Church of England, who make no secret of their opinion, that such young women serve God more acceptably, and lead a holier and a "higher life"—that is the phrase—by undertaking perpetual vows of holy purity, holy obedience, and holy charity, and so forth, than by entering the blessed state of matrimony; or until that auspicious period arrives, by yielding such a natural and scriptural obedience to their parents as is involved in the oftentimes irksome, and at all times unromantic, details of household economy. No church on earth, no power under heaven, can set aside the injunction, "Children, obey your parents in the Lord." It is painful to think it, and still more to say it, nor does it look well for the Church in its organisation of woman's work, that any young girl of true and sanctified worth should be permitted to imagine that it is any part of her mission to forsake the mother whom God gave her, for another mother of her own selection—a mother-superior who, from facts which have come before the public, is often as despotic as she is unfeeling.

Nor is it right that a daughter should "scorn a father's care," and be instructed by a certain class of ecclesiastics that she should eliminate the best instincts of her nature, in order to yield unquestioning obedience to a father-confessor. There is nothing godly, there is nothing even womanly, in that. This is unfair to the woman, and it is unfaithful to the Church. The Church wants nursing sisters for the sick—not nuns. It wants bible women and mission women to visit the poor and ignorant. It wants preaching women. It wants Christian women who have the power given to them by God to proclaim the glad tidings of salvation to those of their own sex who have not heard it,—yes, in their own sphere; and all I can say to those who object to women preaching is, that if all the clergy who fill our pulpits could only preach half as wisely or half as well as some women whom I have heard preach, there would be good times for the Church of England.

The Most Rev. the PRESIDENT.

I HOPE we shall not be so very sensitive: do not let us be so sensitive.

REV. G. W. WELDON.

FOR the severance of young women from the sympathy of nature and of society around them, there is neither warrant nor counterpart in the Word of God. On the contrary St. Paul says, "I will, therefore, that the younger women marry"—I hope no gentleman will hiss that sentiment. "I will, therefore, that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully." The Church wants women who have the inherent power to accept day by day a life of toil and self-denial in the service of the neglected and the forsaken, and who can glorify God by their good works arising out of unfeigned love for their Lord and Master. Above all, the Church wants women who can manage to combine their religious views with common sense and active benevolence.

With regard to the vexed question of work done by communities or otherwise, it would seem that it is better organised and more systematic when carried on by a community than by the desultory efforts of individuals, however earnest or well disposed; at the same time life in a community is at the least an artificial life,

and, somehow or other, an undefinable spirit of restlessness generally pervades the sisterhood, so that their church notions become higher and higher, till at last they can find no spiritual repose until they are absorbed into the bosom of the Church of Rome. Of this two instances suggest themselves to me, as stated by Miss Goodman, who refers to two sisterhoods, in one of which half the ladies once connected with it are now in the Church of Rome; and another, in which the mother-superior and all her children went over bodily to Rome.

The Most Rev. the PRESIDENT.

I AM prepared to adjourn the meeting at this point unless I can secure order. The rev. gentleman is not bound to name. It might be inexpedient for him to do so, although of course his argument loses something of its force by his not naming—but that is his affair.

REV. G. W. WELDON.

I SHOULD be sorry to think that my argument should lose any of its force, and therefore I will name. I refer to a sisterhood in Osnaburgh street, and I may add further, that the sisterhood to which I refer went over to France, and after a short novitiate there in a French nunnery they returned to England, and worked in Islington under the spiritual direction of Father Oakley.

Rev. J. W. GEDGE, M.A., Diocesan Inspector of Schools in the Diocese of Winchester.

I AM sure that neither your grace nor those present at this meeting of the Congress would wish our deliberations on this subject to degenerate into a discussion as to the merits or demerits of sisterhoods. I will endeavour, therefore, to bring back the debate into its legitimate channel, by pointing out one or two other ways open for women's work in the Church besides those already spoken of. And first, in national schools. There can be no doubt that, owing to the expense of maintaining these schools, they are becoming more and more middle-class schools. As such, they open out a vast field for ladies who wish to earn their own living and, at the same time, do a good work for the Church. At present such ladies turn almost exclusively to private tuition; but if they will submit to a two years' training at the Bishop Otter's Memorial College, at Chichester, they can then obtain a Government certificate, and become teachers in Government schools. In these they will have shorter hours, longer holidays, and better salaries, besides far more freedom than most private governesses; while the gain to the Church will be immense. But besides this paid work, there is much voluntary work which ladies can well do in national schools by looking after the pupil teachers, lending them books, teaching them music, making friends of them, and so influencing them for good at a most important period of their lives. Let me also say one word about ladies and domestic servants. The Girls' Friendly Society has been alluded to, and it is doing a great work. But let ladies look a little nearer home. What about their own servants? These are days of great religious privileges. Most of us are accustomed to go weekly to the Holy Communion. But I have often been told by servants that they cannot attend because they cannot be spared early on account of breakfast, or late because of dinner. Could not the young ladies of the family sometimes make the beds, or lay the cloth, or boil the eggs on Sunday morning, to let their servants share those privileges which they value so much for themselves? In a

word, let ladies try and influence the hearts of those who are strangers from home whether servants, pupil teachers or others, and they will be doing a good work for Christ and his Church, which shall not be in vain in the Lord.

Rev. C. N. GRAY, Vicar of Helmsley.

I WISH to say a few words in defence of sisterhoods. The sisters who work in my parish do *not* "walk about with their eyes on the ground," nor are they "the creatures of fancy and romance." On the contrary they are ready to do what others will not do. It was not so long ago that one sister nursed, for six weeks, four persons, a man and three women, lying ill of fever in a cottage in a lonely part in one of the dales in my parish, into which none of the other parishioners would venture for love or money. I wish, however, now to say a word in the name of Christian charity on behalf of sisterhoods and the High Church party—if I must use the hateful word "party"—with which they are exclusively connected, as you will all grant. I honestly believe from my heart that if all the members of this Congress and others outside of it would endeavour with greater Christian charity to understand better what other parties in the Church really believe and practise, there would be more peace and far less dissension amongst us. I may safely say that, from the discussions of yesterday morning and this afternoon, it is quite evident that there is great ignorance as to what we, the High Church clergy and the sisterhoods connected with them, teach and believe. It has been imputed to the sisterhoods that they have a Romanizing tendency. That, as a High Church clergyman and one whom his grace would acknowledge to be a black sheep in his diocese, I distinctly deny. What we are doing is this:—we are trying to revivify those doctrines and practices which are the rightful inheritance of the Church of England as a true branch of the Catholic Church, preserved at the Reformation, though dropped out of sight in the eighteenth century. We therefore hold that to go to Rome would be a distinct sin against Christ—the sin of schism. Again: imputations have been cast upon the sisters as regards the question of confession. Well, who in this room, with the prayer-book in their hands, can deny that the Church of England does teach confession? I advise gentlemen who cry "No, no," to go home and read the exhortation in the communion service and the office for the visitation of the sick. Those who say or think that we teach a "mediæval system" of compulsory confession are under a mistake; and I would advise such persons to study more carefully what the teaching of the High Church party really is. I am quite sure that his grace would not refuse to accept a person who came to him troubled in conscience, even though he came regularly month by month, before receiving the holy communion; nor would any priest, be he High, Broad, or Low, dare refuse to receive such a confession in the face of the Church's direction on the matter. As to the "modern doctrine of the Holy Eucharist"—it has been said that the sisterhoods accept that doctrine, and therefore I am keeping to the question—I am defending them as members of the High Church party. There are a good many "modern doctrines;" but our sisterhoods hold, as all High Churchmen hold, most distinctly, the doctrine of St. Augustine, of St. Chrysostom, of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and last, though not least, of St. Paul the Apostle himself. I have only one word more—understand us better and you will abuse us less.

The Most Rev. the PRESIDENT.

I THINK it right to say with reference to the personal appeal of the last speaker to me, that I never called him a black sheep, or a sheep of any kind.

Rev. C. N. GRAY.

I SAID that your grace would acknowledge that I am a black sheep.

The Most Rev. the PRESIDENT.

I DON'T think, after the address we have just heard, that any one would call Mr. Gray a sheep, under any form.

Rev. Canon HOARE, Vicar of Trinity Church, Tunbridge Wells.

I FEEL extreme difficulty in speaking on this subject for only five minutes at the close of the meeting. We have had a burning question before us, and I have a burning spirit to be at it. With all my heart and soul I should like to take up some of the points which have been alluded to by the last speaker, but I think I had better not. I will give you instead one passage of scripture from which the late vicar of Sheffield (the present Bishop of Sodor and Man) preached in my church—a text which left a deep and lasting impression on all the working women in my parish. The words were those spoken to Moses—"What is that in thine hand?" Moses had in his hand a rough shepherd's staff, which he had doubtless cut from some thorn tree in the wilderness. With that staff he afterwards divided the Red Sea—with that staff he struck the rock, and the waters flowed forth to assuage the thirst of the rebellious Israelites—and that staff was the symbol of all the power he possessed as God's chosen leader of his people through the wilderness. Now, that rod was not some golden staff imported from some distant land—but *that which was in his hand*. Let the thousands and ten thousands of women who are anxious to work for God bear that in mind. Let them not think that if they had the powers and position of Florence Nightingale, or Miss Whately, or others of the great heroines of the Church of Christ, they would then do wonderful things; but consider the question, "What is that in thine hand?" Nor let them suppose that they must lay aside what they have, and seek for something they have not. They have fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters—and are not they like the staff in "thine hand"? They have their pastors wanting help, and the poor all around them, children in the schools, young people who have just left school, mothers' meetings, and innumerable means of usefulness on every side. Let them take what is at hand, and not go out to seek for opportunities which God has not given. There never was a greater delusion than to call the abandonment of home duties "the religious life." The true religious life in Jesus Christ is a life spent in close and intimate communion with Him in that state of life unto which it pleases God to call us—a life which sheds a holy radiance on all around, which makes every person in the home happy, and spreads its sacred influence wherever the home-power comes.

The Very Rev. J. S. HOWSON, D.D., Dean of Chester.

THE subject on which we have been engaged is one which also engaged the attention of the Church Congress at Oxford in 1862. He who then presided lies in his honoured grave, but Bishop Wilberforce "being dead yet speaketh." His sentiments on that occasion were expressed clearly and distinctly. At the close of a

meeting, in which the arguments were well sustained on both sides, he used the following words:—

“ I should not have felt at liberty to take any part in the arrangements of any sisterhood of which such vows (*i.e.*, of celibacy) formed a part, because, first, I see no warrant for them in the Word of God, and it would seem to me that to encourage persons to make vows for which there is no distinct promise given, that they should be able to keep them, would be entangling them in a yoke of danger; secondly, because it seems to me that our Church has certainly discouraged such vows; and thirdly, because it seems to me really to be of the essence of such a religious life that should be continued, not because in a moment of past fervour a vow was made, but because by a continual life of love that life is *again and again* freely offered to that service to which it was originally dedicated. I feel, therefore, that I may venture to say that instead of perpetual vows representing the higher, it is the admission of a lower standard. I have felt it my duty to say this that there might be no mistake as to my view.”*

And now I wish to put a question to those who advocate sisterhoods conducted on the principle of life vows. Mr. Berdmore Compton laid great stress on these institutions having the superintendence of the bishop of the diocese; but what would he do if the bishop should hold such opinions as those which I have just quoted? Would he have expected the late Bishop of Oxford (who never retracted the words spoken by him with so much solemnity) to give up his scruples and yield his conscientious convictions, or are those who manage such sisterhoods to give up their opinions with regard to vows? The Bishop of Lincoln, in a recent letter to Archdeacon Sir George Prevost, has said that vows cannot be taken with safety until a woman is sixty years old, referring to no lower authority, as to the limit of age, than St. Paul. You will see the difficulty in which such men as Bishops Wordsworth and Wilberforce would be placed in dealing with these institutions so long as they remain as they are now constituted. I have heard that in more dioceses than one there is now great perplexity from this cause. Some ladies who had been induced to take the vows at an early age, now wish to marry. Who is to release them from their vows? Mr. Berdmore Compton said that the bishops must have power to give dispensations, but where are they to get that power? Closely connected, too, with vows is the confessional, and I strongly urge the Congress to consider well this connection. Mr. Berdmore Compton, who is one of the best and most skilful speakers at Church Congresses, was careful to reserve that point until the close of his address; and he sat down immediately after he had stated that those clergy who had had the greatest experience in hearing private confessions were the most fitted to direct the spiritual life of these sisterhoods. I will follow his example by simply asking, in conclusion, the Congress to consider, side by side with that statement, what a hundred bishops assembled at Lambeth, with our two archbishops at their head, have recently said on this subject.

* Report of Oxford Church Congress (1862), p. 149.

MEETING OF WORKING MEN.

THURSDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 3rd, 1878.

The Right Hon. and Most Rev. the PRESIDENT took the
Chair at 7 P.M.

ADDRESSES.

The Right. Hon. and Most Rev. the PRESIDENT.

MY DEAR FRIENDS,—I hope it is not a mere expression of course to say that. I have met a great many of you before in this hall—I have met a great many of you in the various works; therefore, I hope I can honestly say for both sides, “my dear friends.” The working-men’s meeting is an appendage of the Church Congress, and took its origin in York, and it took its origin in the spontaneous request of the working-men, that we would meet them, and talk to them about the things which concern their best interests—and I think it has now become a matter of course. You would, if necessary, have preferred your request of the same kind; and we should have met you if the Congress had never before recognised the working-man. Now when we were new to the business we did not quite understand the working-man—and I will tell you how we did it. We began by saying, “you are working-men, and I am a working-man, and we have come to speak as one working-man to the other.” Now I am afraid the working-men saw through that, and saw the difference between the position of a man who is a bishop and a man who works day by day for his daily wages and has but little to fall back upon if his wages are withdrawn—so that common-place expression has disappeared for ever, and I and my successors in this position wash our hands altogether of that. We are not working-men addressing working-men; we are ministers of Christ speaking to working-men about that which concerns us both. We have a stronger bond than that of being working-men together; we are immortal creatures, together wending our way through this troublous and, often to you, wearing life, to another life hereafter; and the question between us is how best to do it. There is another mistake which is sometimes made—we patronise the working-men. When you speak to a neighbour’s child, you say, “My fine little fellow, how is it?”—speaking to it in a kind of child language, which often the child sees through; and if he only dared to tell you what he thought of it, his opinion would not be flattering. I know you a great deal too well to begin to talk that kind of child’s talk to you: I am going to meet you on level ground; I am going to talk to you in language you and I both understand. There will be no attempt at condescension; nothing but perfectly fair dealing on the one hand and criticism on the other. But I am going to say what may at the outset seem a somewhat flattering thing. I am going to say that the future of England lies with the working-men; but it does not take the shape of a compliment; and therefore I want to justify it and explain what I mean. If I read history aright, there has been a constant coming forward of class after class, plainly pointing to this—that we are to look forward to a time when every class in the nation, in one great harmony,

will be seeking the common good ; when oppression and ignorance, and vice itself, shall be taken away from all classes alike, and all shall stand equal, whatever be the form of government, in the common weal. When that which was called the Great Charter was granted, it was an affair between the king and the barons ; in the time of Charles I. the strife was between the king and the middle classes ; and if I do not mistake very much, it is in this generation, and not before, that the true position of the working classes has been recognised : that they have come thoroughly to feel their own feet ; and we for our own part have learned thoroughly to recognise the facts. How is that ? In the first place, the franchise has been granted practically to everybody. In the next place education has been long recognised by the Church as the healer of our evils, and it is now recognised by the whole nation. The State has ordered that every man shall be educated, and it is the duty of every man to see his children educated. The State has said it, and you are the State. You have passed the law, and you must carry it out, and henceforth there shall be no ignorant man in England, unless indeed by some great misadventure, for the system provides that ignorance shall be taken away from every door. Well, now then the future is with the working-men ; and here my compliments have run out. I am not quite sure how the working-man is going to deal with us in the future. It is a very grave and momentous question, and there are all the signs and symptoms which indicate a great change. I see in many quarters a great weariness of life, and of the old forms of life ; and I see a tendency to look at old institutions and push them on one side, as if we felt that we had sucked out the juice from them, and there was nothing to do but to throw the rind away. I see a great tendency to form new combinations of a rash kind and description ; and all over Europe we discern the same kind of symptoms, an uneasy upheaving of the opinion of the working classes in directions which at present we are scarcely able to estimate, but which take a form, which in France is called communism, in England socialism, and in Russia nihilism, and there is the same thing almost everywhere by whatever name it may be called. There is a good deal in the world that wants to be corrected. Well, as far as I understand, they have this common ground—and I am not going to speak in terms of vituperation, but to discuss the thing as far as it can be in a philosophical way. Then what are these socialisms, communisms, nihilisms and secret societies ? What do they mean ? They mean that one class is arming itself with the determination to get from the other classes, on what terms it may, as much of the good things of this world as it can possibly gather and that its hands can hold when it has gathered. Therefore there is this one common ground amongst them all, that is, self-assertion of one class as against the rest. Well, now the book which lies under my hand—the New Testament—tells me a story that seems the exact opposite of that. It says that strength lies in giving up ; it says that a man is not to seek for all that he can get ; that is not the way to be strong nor to be happy. It says,—and here are the words, and I would to God that I could write them upon every heart in this room,—“ If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me ; for whosoever will save his life shall lose it, and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it.” Now which of these two systems is to be the system of the future ? Well, I daresay you are disposed to say :—“ You know, we must do the very best we can for ourselves. That is the way in which labour is regulated. We are going to attempt to do the best for ourselves, and the maxim which you have read is very beautiful, very nice for those who take to religion ; and I daresay there will come a time when I shall lie down with nothing to do with the labour market ; but mine is the maxim of prudence and common sense. Let me do the best I can for myself, and let others take care of themselves.” Now what I say is this : that unless that maxim which I have read

to you just now is good for every day life too, it is good for nothing. Religion, according to my view of it, is not the carrying to a dying man a kind of comfort which he has never had when he was living: to say that you have lived upon one principle in this life—that you have lived a long life upon one principle—and now we are going to teach you another. That is not my notion of religion. Religion is heaven, and heaven begins here. It begins with the love of God in the heart of man. It can begin with the child of two; it can ripen in the child of ten. It can go with the strong man of five-and-twenty to his work. It can assist the father to bring up his children, and would be a sacred bond between them. It can make the home happy, wholesome and sweet. It can bind society together, so that two men meeting in the street shall not scowl as they pass one another, but shall salute one another with love and with mutual regard and respect. This is my notion of religion. And I tell you honestly, that if we were compelled to accept the other definition of religion, as a thing for the death-bed and the future only, all spirit and all strength would be taken out of us for our task. How could we commend that for the future which men have turned their backs upon with all their might in the present? How can we expect heaven to come in the heart hereafter, if heaven has been excluded from it in the present? Well, then, that is the point at issue to-night—"Which way are we to live, and which will be the best for us?" I daresay I have gone over the same ground with some of you before, but I know you will pardon me if I speak of it again now. I put it to you as men of good sense—does the selfish principle or the loving principle answer best? Take this for example. Here is a man who says:—"I earn five-and-twenty or thirty shillings a week, and I must have my drink every day. Mine is very hard work, and I want a good deal of drink, and then I must, on a Saturday, have a holiday; and I have got a dog of rare qualities—I am training my dog; and then you know there is a little house at the corner"—I hope the Mayor of Sheffield does not hear me—"there is a little house at the corner where I go to make bets now and then. I hardly know the name of one racehorse from another; but there is great excitement in betting. I never saw these horses with such very poetical and mythological names; but at the same time I can bet five to one on them with the best. I enjoy all this kind of excitement. It lifts me out of myself; and then, when there is a number of us jolly good fellows at the public-house, or when we are having a coursing match or a dog race, or anything of that kind, why, really I forget my troubles for a time, and enjoy myself." Well, but then you know this is a married man. I have a great respect for him and a great regard for him; but I say he is acting quite wrongly. He is a married man, he has got a wife, and I think his wife is as good as himself; but he does not. He has got three as nice children as you ever saw. They will be as strong, stout fellows as he is. You see it in their sturdy looks and bright little faces now. He is fond of them, and now and then gives them a pat on the head, when he gets leisure from those engrossing pursuits to which I have referred. And so it comes out that my friend has to distribute the good things of life between himself and his wife and his three children; and he sits down to divide them into equal parcels. Oh! no, not a bit of it. He has a very clear opinion that the lion's share must go to the head of the family, and he gives to the wife so very small a share of all his earnings to keep the family upon, that I would rather not mention at this moment how small it is. And those poor little children! The proper place for children is at the father's and mother's knee; and the father and the mother miss a source of unspeakable comfort and satisfaction provided for them by the Almighty, when they neglect their children and decide to seek much more expensive amusement somewhere else. Now, my friends, is it not a clear case with regard to that man that he is on the wrong track altogether? Now let us look at another point. You have all a certain pride as belonging to the working class.

The Sheffield working-man holds his head pretty high. Right. But it has been mentioned on this platform already, that the traffic in drink, which your excellent mayor has got his eye upon—I believe it has gone down just a little; but still £145,000,000 is so enormous a sum that we ought to pause for five minutes to try if we can find something to measure that amount by; but still it is a fact that £145,000,000 is paid in this country for drink. If you want a measure to measure it by, I will take a measure I have applied before. Well, the whole expense of Government, its army, navy—not the Church, for that is a fallacy; I have had that here before; no, not one penny of it goes in that direction—the army, navy, civil service, and the whole cost of the civil establishments, from the Crown down to the lowest officer of the State, is somewhere about £75,000,000 a year. So you see it is not very far short of double that amount we spend in drink. Now, I suppose you will admit that half that amount is quite superfluous. Let us put it a little further, and say that eight-tenths, nine-tenths, are superfluous. We had a doctor on the platform who told us that some drink is good. My doctor has told me so; having lately been a teetotaller, there has been a little lapse under that learned person's prescriptions. But somewhere or other about seven-eighths, or eight-tenths, or nine-tenths, is the point where the superfluous stops and the necessary part begins. Now, then, that indulgence is something to which we give ourselves. Our Lord said, "Let him deny himself." If we applied that to this drink, then we could deny ourselves of that eight-tenths. What an enormous power it would put into the hands of the working-man; and it would relieve him from a taxation he imposes on himself. Don't talk about taxation; if you saved that, you might laugh at the taxation. What is that compared with the income tax, and the tax on tobacco? You could pay the whole of that by the diminished use of these liquors. You have the key of the position in your own hands. Therefore, taking it on that low ground self-denial is wise and a strong thing, and if that is to go on, in which I rejoice—the raising of the lower class—and I shall rejoice in their raising themselves till they are on an equality with ourselves—if that is to go on, it must be hastened by self-denial. By the exercise of frugality we can oftentimes redeem a wretched, pinched home, and by diminishing our needless expenditure we shall become by this self-denial wise, prudent, and strong, with wisdom sent down from heaven above to lift us out of what is low and grovelling, into that which is high and true. So now, my friends, I can't of course pursue this subject through all its branches and ramifications. But I think you will see I have said something so far to establish a new kind of relation between the minister of God and you. In the first place, we are not people who come in with the undertaker at the last moment, to set you right when you have been all wrong before. That is not our aim. We aim at something quite different. In the next place, we are not people who stand outside your life, and want to censure it and find fault with it, and say—"We are very respectable people ourselves, but those working people are very hard to deal with." This is a thing which, if ever it existed, belongs to a past age. We don't want anything from you. I remember when once in Sheffield before, somebody said we were all paid by the State out of the taxes. I offered to meet five hundred Sheffield men and to show them that we were not. I repented somewhat of that, because nine hundred insisted I should come, and I did, and we settled all that. We have nothing to do with you as to our living. For what is the bond between you and me? The bond of love. That is stronger and deeper than any other tie there is in the world. We are taught by the Master Himself—and we are not worth our salt if we are not true to it—that every man is dear to Him. We want to see every man living well and wisely; and so far from looking down upon them and wishing to guide their hands, and leaving no freedom of action, we wish them to be as free as possible. We wish to see their condition constantly improving.

But then we know that there is no freedom at all except on the terms of the gospel. A candidate comes sometimes and tells you what he is going to do to get your vote—there is this and that to be amended to set you free. There is something at the back, however, which is the first condition of all freedom—you must be free from sin, because sin is the real bondage. The poor drunkard is the worst of slaves. That is no figure of speech. The strong man, if you take him and bind him with fetters, he is still free in a sense; his very look is a protest against your tyranny. You have bound him, though you have no right to bind him, and he will one day pay you out for his bondage. The drunkard can do nothing but remain in his fetters, which he has forged for himself—can do nothing but remain in them until the Son of God comes with healing in His hand, with love in His face and He says to him—"Brother, if any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me;" and even for that worst of captives forgiveness, redemption, regeneration, may still be given. Well, now, my friends, we must begin to readjust ourselves a little. Here is the case, now. You are none of you colliers, I think; so I will take my illustration from the colliers, then we shall not quarrel. Coal became very dear a few years ago—twice as dear as it was before. The moment the labourer saw that the price went up, he said, "I want a little more for my wages." I don't wonder he said that; just the thing a man would say. "We are all working in the same boat. The capitalist is getting more than he expected, and I am the labourer, and I expect a little more." And quite right. But then coal begins to go down, and the capitalist is obliged to come down in his price. Nature works it out for him; he is tied hand and foot. But the labourer says, "I won't be tied—my wages shall not go down." The same law, however, that took them up will take them down again. That is a very short sentence, but we must accept it. If we could get that understood throughout the length and breadth of the land, it would be very good for all parties. A foolish man says, "I won't be rained upon; I protest against the rain." If there comes a storm and you have no umbrella, you will be rained upon till you are like a drowned rat, because the law of nature is so. The water that has gone up in vapour will descend in showers, and if you are so very foolish as to go out, or if you are so unfortunate as to be obliged to go out, then you will be wet, by the law of nature. You must submit to that law. You were very glad of it when it was in the ascending scale. I say if we could only get people to learn that, it would save a great deal of heart-burning and a great deal of waste, and things would go on better. I hope I have not put it too strongly; and then it is a collier I spoke of, and you know he is away. But you will say that is political economy and not religion. I don't quite admit that. I think religion would pave the way for it. I think that if a man was not thinking of himself first of all, he would be a better pupil in the school of political economy; he would be able to look round him and say, "All classes are in the same condition, and I must expect to rise with the prosperity and sink with the adversity of the country. What is more, we are in the same boat, and I must share the common fortunes of all." My friends, the contrary is going on. A contention against the laws of nature is being here and there established. These *isms* that I spoke of, this communism and the like, are protests of the lower against the higher—in some cases protests against real oppression; but in other cases they are different from that. They are protests against what is the natural law. So far as they are protests against tyranny and injustice, they may in some form prevail. So far as they are protests against the law of nature, they cannot possibly prevail. I do not know, my friends, how long you and I have been gossiping together, but I feel, along with a great apprehension, a great love for our work to-night. Nobody could possibly come into this room and remain unmoved by the spectacle. Certainly not I, who feel, after sixteen or seventeen years of in-

tercourse, that I can so freely cast myself upon the love of this place. There are blots and spots upon the history of this grand town. I can but hope that occasions of this kind will make it impossible for such blots and spots to re-appear. You remember the history of that remorse-stricken creature who confessed his foul conspiracy and murder into which he had been led, in those investigations, now happily passed over for many years, in which this town played so conspicuous a part. We will put that behind us. That belongs not to the chapter of "Let him deny himself and take up his cross." It belonged to the chapter of Cain and Abel—"Am I my brother's keeper?" "I will be as selfish as I like, even at the expense of life itself." It belonged to that chapter. We have closed the book upon that chapter. We will open another and a brighter page which shall bear upon its front the word "Love" at the top, the word "Love" in the middle, and at the close. The word "Love" shall be the first and the last of the page, for it is the word of Jesus Christ Himself. I look back along the course of history, and I see the struggles of this great people in its progress towards their present greatness—struggles often noble in their self-devotion—struggles always respectable because they tended to make a great country free. I shall not live to see the great era that I think is yet to follow. But I seem to hear already the mighty tread of the up-coming multitude, the future working-men of England. I listen to hear how they march. Are they coming in a noisy and confused rabble, with no rhythm in their tread, with loud and angry voices as they come? They are marching under the wrong commander; they are marching without officers and without drill; they will never come to good. But I listen again, and I hear that their march is rhythmical, is regular. I hear them as they come, and I know in a moment what is the music to which they are marching. Who is the commander who has given them the order? They are coming up a loving and an ordered band. No one is trying to over-reach his neighbour. No class is sharpening a knife against the life of any other class. They are a compact army. Will it ever be? Will any one ever live to see it? [A Voice: "Yes."] You say yes, and perhaps you say yes rightly; but if it be so, you may depend upon it the officer in command of that army is Jesus Christ, and the music by which they are marching is the music of the gospel. They are singing, "Let him deny himself, and take up his cross." That is the reason they are marching in such order. That is their title to be the rulers of the future, if rulers they are to be. It is because of this wisdom that they so march, and this discipline they have undergone that they are a strong army, marching beautifully, marching with banners. Oh! my friends, may it be so! But I come back from this dream, and I say to you that there may be the beginning of it this very evening. The realisation of it may come at once to the man who will embrace Christ, who will deny himself, and who will take up his cross. My friend who said "yes," I hope spoke truly; but it is not necessary for us to speculate, nor for us to wait. Jesus Christ is ever ready. We that stand here have come to you in His name, and for nothing else; and we say to you, turn to Him, and love Him. And if you deny yourself and take up your cross, all the happiness of which I spoke as a distant vision of the future, all the security that arises from being perfectly safe with death on every hand, and all that we can hear about heaven, is realised to us already. We are secure because we are in a state in which we should like to die; we are in heaven because heaven is formed in us already as soon as the love of God begins. Now my friends, this is our message to you; and I think I may venture to ask you now what you think of it? Is it a message which we ought to be shy about proclaiming to you? Have we, so far as we have gone, dictated to you in any manner, or spoken disparagingly about you? Have we not taken counsel with you? Faults we have pointed out, and if we were to change places, you would point out my faults, and I am sensible of it; so that we do not lose our common

ground. The message we bring to you is this. There has been a Church Congress in this town for several days. That means a discussion about religious things: and religious things are not Sunday things: they are the best interests of life, and we have come to give you your share of them, and to tell you a door is open, that Christ loves you even as He loves us, and wishes nothing but that you should be one with Him, equal in his sight, redeemed by Him, forgiven by Him, enlightened by Him. Unto all His love is offered; it is necessary to you; take your share of it, for it is offered to you to-night.

The Right Rev. HARVEY GOODWIN, D.D., Lord Bishop of Carlisle.

I FEEL extreme pleasure in speaking to you this evening, but at the same time I feel the difficulty of doing so. My difficulty consists, to a certain extent, in following the archbishop, who has already addressed you in words of such remarkable and touching eloquence. But amongst other things, the archbishop is my commanding officer; if he told me to leave this hall I should be bound to do so; and as he has told me to come and speak to you, I was bound to obey him in this also. I should like to tell you a little secret. I heard a few days ago that I was to have the honour and pleasure of addressing you. I felt horribly frightened, and I have been thinking about it ever since. I did not know upon what subject it would be best to speak, and so I said the other evening to the kind friends who are so hospitably entertaining me in Sheffield, "I will give half-a-crown to anybody who will tell me what to talk about on Thursday evening." The good lady of the house said to me, "Keep your half-crown, and I will tell you what to do." I said, "Thank you;" and she said, "Just speak to those Sheffield men in a plain, straightforward way, without any nonsense; and you may depend upon it that they will listen to you, and be glad to hear you." I thought it was exceedingly good advice, and so I kept my half-crown. My lord archbishop has a great advantage over me, in that he knows you all very well: you all belong to his flock; he is your shepherd, and you are the sheep; whereas I have little to do with you; nevertheless I may have some little claim upon you. You may have heard of a person who was asked whether he was an Irishman, and he said, No, he was not, but his *mother* was. Now I am not a Yorkshireman, but my mother was; therefore, as being half Yorkshire, I am sure you will listen to me patiently.

The difficulty of speaking on an occasion of this kind is just this: instead of having a printed programme and being told you are to speak on a particular subject, you are told you are to stand up and speak on things in general; and the difficulty is, which thing to select. I have thought that I might reduce what I have to say to a form in which you would remember it, if I put it in the form of three pieces of advice. If you find my advice is poor, useless stuff, throw it away into the first gutter you come to. My first piece of advice, which perhaps may sound plain and rather flat, is that I hope you will all be good men. Well, that sounds flat; but it is not quite so flat as it sounds. There is a great deal in the words *good men*, because we thus really comprehend all our duties in this life, and all that concerns the life to come. In point of fact, to *try* to be good—to *be* good—is the duty of the youngest child, of the oldest man, in fact, of every man. The characteristic of man as distinct from the beasts is, that he *can* be good:—good he ought to be; it is the great characteristic of manhood that he can be so. Take the other word "man." I won't go into the question whether we once were monkeys; I put that on one side, and will deal with the matter in another way. A short time ago I heard a

gentleman making a speech at a meeting; he was what you would probably call a Radical. He said, "I am for manhood suffrage," and there was a tremendous cheer—there was no hanging fire at all—the people all cheered to the echo. When they had got quiet, he said, "Wait: I am for giving every man a vote; but I must define what a man is. I don't consider a creature upon two legs, who turns his body into a beer barrel, to be a *man*. I don't consider a fellow who kicks his wife to death to be a *man*." No doubt if he had heard the description which has been given by the archbishop of the man with the wife and three children, and the dog, and the betting and so forth, he would have said that he who spent the greater part of his money in betting and gave only a small part of it to his wife and children, was not worthy of being called a *man*. Therefore, it may be that the meaning of being a *man* is not quite so clear as it appears to be at first sight. I believe that to be a man, in the highest and best sense of the term, is the greatest gift and privilege which God has given to his highest and noblest creatures. What do we read in the first chapter of God's Word upon this very subject? We read that God created the rest of the universe in various ways. First He said, "Let there be light, and there was light." Then He created the various heavenly bodies. Then He called forth the grass upon the earth; and he caused the waters to bring forth living things abundantly; and He caused the earth to teem with life of various kinds. What was the creative act reserved for the last? "God created *man* in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them; and He breathed into their nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." That is a definition of man—a creature created in the image of God. He is not worthy of his creation or worthy of his name unless he tries continually to be like God, and to do the works of God. Well, that is my first piece of advice—"Be good men."

The next piece of advice is this—"Be good Englishmen." I think there is a great deal in having a noble pedigree. We English people have much to be thankful for—much to glory in, if glorying be suitable in such matters. At all events, we have a noble and a glorious history, and we ought to try to be worthy of it. The archbishop has been telling us of a point connected with the working-men which makes it immensely important that working-men should be good Englishmen. They should have a sense of their dignity, and act in a manner worthy of the high position in which they are placed by the law. His Grace spoke about the franchise. Well, I suppose every man here has got a vote. He is an important personage; a much more important personage in that respect than I am, because I have got no vote. It is a curious fact, and a thing for you to think about, that though his Grace the Archbishop of York and myself are honoured with seats in the higher chamber of the Legislature, we have the pleasure of paying all the taxes which you good people choose to put upon our shoulders; but we have no voice of the smallest kind in the laying on of those taxes. We are payers of taxes, and you are the people who make us pay. I do not complain of this condition of things at all, but I am sure that the fact of your having this power in your hands makes it a very important thing that you should exercise it with some discretion. I am not going to tell you on which side you are to vote at the next election, because I have no business to introduce politics. But what I do say is, that every man who has got a vote, and who does not consider that vote a solemn responsibility, which he holds on behalf of his fellow-countrymen—aye, on behalf of poor fellows like me—I say the man who does not consider it a solemn responsibility, but who simply looks upon it as a thing which he may, perhaps, in some undiscovered way, turn into a five-pound or a ten-pound note, that fellow is not worthy of the name of an Englishman. Then there is another point with regard to being Englishmen. You would scarcely believe it, but I think of *Sheffield* every day of my life. You don't know why? I will tell you. I shave every morning. I have got a box, which

contains seven Sheffield razors—one for every day of the week. Only think of it! Those razors were given to me nearly forty years ago, just at the time I began to shave. They were made by Rodgers and Sons, of Sheffield. When they were given to me by a kind friend, he said, "I bought these in Sheffield myself; they told me that I had got the best article that could be made;" and they have been, in fact, the very best articles I ever had to do with in my life. They have never been ground in the course of those forty years, they very seldom go upon the hones, and I myself never put them upon the strop. I found out by experience that my stropping made them blunt instead of making them sharp; so I just leave them alone, and I shave with them—each one to its day—with perfect comfort every day of my life. Why do I tell you this? Not merely to make you laugh; but because there is a great and important moral connected with it. Why is it that those razors, after having been used for forty years, are as good now as when I first had them, and such that I would not take any price for them? They were good Englishmen who made those razors, and they did not scamp their work. There is all the difference between an article made for use, and one made merely for exportation; and these were made for use, and very capital they are. A few weeks ago, I saw in the *Times* an article about trade—one of those little notices that you see in the commercial column. Well, it did not refer to Sheffield; therefore (as his Grace said with regard to colliers) I may speak about the matter without offence. The notice stated there were a great many orders for edge tools received in a certain town from the colonies, but that they were generally accompanied with the condition that the tools should be of American make. Now, I confess that I felt a chill come over me when I saw that notice. It seemed to tell me that the Americans were making honest goods, and that, at the same time, some of our own people were making dishonest ones. Why should the colonies write and prefer American-made goods, except because our own goods were scamped? The men who made such goods could not be good Englishmen. I say, then, to you Sheffield men—If you want to hold up your heads as you ought, as high, honourable workmen, then don't scamp your work; do the best you can to turn out the very best articles which possibly can be turned out, and thus keep up the name of Sheffield. I am not telling you what does not apply to myself. It is not the working-man only who can scamp his work. Bishops can do it quite as truly as working-men. In point of fact, it is an easier thing for a bishop to scamp his work than for a working-man to scamp his. If you think upon it, the higher you go in the order of work the easier it is. Take the lowest case of all. Suppose a poor fellow is on the treadmill, he can't scamp his work, do what he may. I well remember the story of a country magistrate who wanted to know what the treadmill was like; so he went one day when the mill was at work, and took his place upon the wheel in the usual way. When he had taken two or three turns he wanted to get off; the gaoler, however, said, "You can't get off, sir; you must go on till you come off at the other end." So he found he could not scamp his work. But when you come to the case of skilled labour, you find all the difference in the world between the man who puts work into what he does, and the man who does not. I have sometimes seen in a shop two articles that looked to me exactly the same; and I have said to the man, "Why do you charge twice as much for the one as for the other?" "Oh," he replies, "there is much more *work* in the one than in the other." If you come to a clergyman's work, a clergyman can scamp his work most completely if he pleases. He receives his stipend, and is bound to do as much work as he can, for the love of Christ. There is no limit to the work he has to do, except the limit of physical and mental power. And if you come to the office which I have the honour and privilege of holding, then, God knows, we too can scamp our work if we please. But whether in a lower or a higher kind, the man who does a good day's work, knowing

he has a Master in heaven—the man who throws his whole heart and soul into the making of a razor, or into the management of a diocese—that is the man who is worthy of being called a man, and who will stand erect before God on the great day of account.

So much for my second piece of advice—I promised you three, and now you shall have the last. I am sure you will be glad I have come to it. It is one which is suggested to me by the fact of this being a *Church Congress*; and, as I have said to you already, “Be good *men*,” and “Be good *Englishmen*,” so I say thirdly and lastly “Be good Churchmen.” That clapping looks as if most of you were Churchmen. I did not know whether you were or not. I thought it probable that there were a good many of you here this evening who would not call yourselves Churchmen; and what I was going to say was, that if there were such present, I hoped I should not say anything that would offend them or make them sorry they came here. If there be any person here who is what we call a Nonconformist, I hope he won’t find that I say anything uncharitable or offensive to him. But I put the question in this way. Here are we, a people who have got a great profession which, if the Nonconformist will not allow that it does him any good, at all events does him no harm; and we have an institution which, I think, any person who is the least charitable towards the Church will admit is doing a vast amount of good. Then what I would say is, first, this Church, as can be easily proved, is the ancient Church of this country. Never be carried away by the notion that the Church of England is a new institution, that it was made by an Act of Parliament, or that it began 300 years ago, at the Reformation. Never be carried away by such clap-trap as that, but believe that for more than a thousand years we have had in this country a continuous Church of Christ, which has been preaching the gospel of Christ to the people, and ministering the sacraments of Christ amongst them. I should like to give what I have to say upon this point a definite bearing in this way. The other evening I was called upon by his Grace the Archbishop to preside at a meeting which was to discuss the question of “free and open churches:” a very interesting discussion it was; but the special point of interest which I want to bring before you is this,—that we had a paper read there by Mr. Fletcher, a working-man. I don’t know whether Mr. Fletcher is here this evening. If he is, he will, I have no doubt, allow me to criticise his paper read the other evening, or at all events, to make a remark or two upon it. Mr. Fletcher told us that he had heard a great many objections raised to the Church of England, but he had never heard the objection made, which was urged with considerable force by several speakers that evening, viz., that the churches were taken possession of by another class of people, and that the poor people were kept out by pews and all the rest of it. He told us he had heard two or three speeches from Mr. Arch, and he had heard every kind of objection raised to the Church of England and every kind of complaint, but that he had never heard that complaint made. I was a good deal struck by the statement; but on thinking upon it afterwards it occurred to me that there might be a very good reason why Mr. Arch should avoid this kind of complaint, because, don’t you see, if he put the people whom he had to lecture in mind of the fact that the parish church was the property of the parishioners, and that every man in the parish had a right to go there, then this result might possibly happen: all his hearers might go to the parish church; and if they did, they would hear the parson speak for himself, and they would find out perhaps that a great deal that Mr. Arch had told them was all moonshine—and that the clergyman was not such a bad fellow after all. Well, that is a result which might possibly happen; and therefore I for one should be exceedingly glad if Mr. Arch would kindly adopt the condition of some of the churches into his catalogue of grievances. If he would persuade the people of England that the parish churches throughout the country were intended for the use

of us all, that every man in this room has a positive right, by the law of the Church and the law of the land, to go to his parish church, where there is a clergyman appointed to minister to him, and whose business it is to visit him in health and in sickness—that, in point of fact, you live in a condition in which there is every possible care taken of you, without money and without price, for your well-being here and your well-being hereafter,—then, I think, a very good thing would have been done by Mr. Arch. To put that point then on one side, let me say, my dear friends, how very much I wish that every working-man did appreciate his parish church a great deal more than many of them do. I believe that the Sunday would be an infinitely pleasanter and happier day to a great many men if they would keep up the practice of worship which they were taught as children. Many of them were taught by their mothers, many of them were taught in Sunday schools, and it was some of the best teaching of their childhood, that they should find their way into the parish church. What is there that should keep working-men away? I will tell you a story that was told me some time ago by a clergyman. He had a Bible-class of working-men, and he said one evening to them, “It is a very funny thing; you fellows seem very pleased to read the Bible with me in the evening; but you won’t go to the Church. Why is it?” “Well, sir,” said one of them, “I will tell you. The parson reads everything out of the book, and we cannot make top nor tail of it; and then as for the man at the chapel, we fancy we can do as well as him ourselves.” That is a terrible dilemma, but what are working-men educated for? Why is it that we pay so much attention to the question of education if the teaching is not to go into the whole life of a man, and be used on Sunday as well as on any other day? Should it not be an end and result of education to enable a man to take part in a higher kind of service than he would have been able to take part in if he had been left in his ignorance? We know very well with regard to missions in foreign lands that divine service has to be reduced to the lowest and the simplest level. The poor savage cannot understand the language of exalted worship, and it has to be brought down to his capacity. So it is in a degree with the uninstructed man in our own country; but I say that if the education of the present generation is worth the thousands a year we pay for it, if it is worth all the labour that has been expended upon it by the clergymen who have been working at it for the last half century, and by those who are working at it now, if it is worth all the toil and trouble expended upon it, it ought to enable a man to enjoy the blessing of reading and using that most blessed book, after the Scriptures, namely, the Book of Common Prayer.

And so, my dear Yorkshire friends, I wish you good evening. My three pieces of advice are these:—Be good *men*. Be good *Englishmen*. Be good *Churchmen*. Let me bring what I have to say upon the Church question now to a close by this remark. His grace has pointed out to you that an enormous power rests at this present time in the hands of the working-man. I don’t grudge him his power. I am prepared to trust you; I believe you will be good working-men and good Englishmen. But let me say a word with regard to the one point which comes before us just now, namely, the question of the Church. His grace has told you that the Church of England, ramifying as it does through the whole country, extending to this great town of Sheffield, and into every wild valley on my mountain diocese;—that this great piece of machinery, this grandest and most blessed gift of God, does not cost you or any one of us one shilling. Then, I say, if the question comes before you as electors—“Shall we upset this Church; or shall we pull it down from its present condition?” Ask yourselves this plain question:—“If we are going to upset it, who is to gain by the upset; and how many will lose by the upset?” “If we revolutionize the state of things which now exists, can we put a better in its place?” Is there not, at least, a danger of our despising a gift of God

which we ought to use and not to despise? I don't want to dictate to you, but, at all events, consider both sides of the question, and I think you will see that if there be a gain, which I have never been able to discover, there must also be a prodigious loss.

I don't like to leave you with these semi-political words as my last words to you this evening. Therefore, just let me make this little addition to what I have said. His grace told you at the beginning of his remarkable address, that we did not come before you to tell you that we were all working-men. I think that his grace was perhaps a little hard on that side of the question. I think there are few men who work harder than his grace himself; but I quite agree to the spirit of what he said to you. I have no doubt it *is* much better to come before you upon the principle his grace laid down, than to try and persuade you that we all, as working-men, are in precisely the same boat. But this we ought to remember, namely, that anyhow, the Head and Master of us all was a genuine working-man. Therefore, while we, who have the higher work of the Church to do, can look upon our Master as the great pattern for our ministry; while we think of Him as the Shepherd and Bishop of souls, so the working-man, as he toils in his workshop, as he labours for his daily bread, perhaps at times finding it hard to supply himself and his family with the things necessary for this life, may remember that he follows a Master Who was Himself truly a working-man, and Who, sometimes, knew not where to lay His head.

Mr. George SKEY, Tamworth.

It is not an easy task for a simple layman to follow an archbishop and a bishop, and such an archbishop and such a bishop. I never felt more than I do at this moment my own utter inability to rise to the solemnity and grandeur of the occasion. I know there are some praying men amongst you, and I ask them just to lift up their hearts that I may occupy the short time which I shall have to address you, with words of edification, words that shall be useful. I shall divide the few remarks I am about to make under two heads—the work, and the Master. A working-man's meeting seems to me to suggest these topics: first, the work: and I will the more readily speak upon this subject because I believe that the popular view of labour is a very mistaken one. Some people think that labour is simply the stern penalty laid upon all mankind for the sin of our first parents:—"In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." But if we look at the matter a little closer, I think we shall be ready to say with the Psalmist, "I will sing of mercy and judgment; unto thee, O Lord, will I sing." It was as if the Almighty had said, "Thou hast fallen by sin; but thou shalt be restored, through repentance and faith in the second Adam, to what thou hast lost in the first; thy affections are corrupted, thy will is perverted, thy mind is estranged; a life of ease and inactivity would ruin thee altogether. Necessity shall be laid upon thee. Thou shalt till the ground: tares also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread. Thou shalt prepare the land with diligence, sow thy seed in faith, reap thy harvest in hope, and eat of thy bread, sweetened with toil and hunger, with thankfulness of heart. Labour shall be thy bane, yet shall it be the antidote; and if well and truly done, and done for Me, then in labour shalt thou find a blessing, in diligence a sure reward." Have you ever considered, my friends, what this world of ours would be if this law of labour were abolished—if the earth spontaneously brought forth her fruits and everything we desired: food to eat, raiment for the body, warmth and shelter, yea, everything that the appetite

craved for or the imagination suggested, to be at hand with the mere wish to possess them, without any care, or thought, or trouble? "Oh, what a happy world it would be!" say some of you. Yes; happy, perchance, if our hearts did but beat and throb in unison with innocence and purity, with holiness and God. But see you not that so long as an impure thought, an evil desire, so long as the least trace of evil or sin remained in these corrupt hearts of ours, so long would the power—the unchecked power—of self-gratification be a power to ruin, not to retrieve; a power to destroy, not to save. And, therefore, God in his mercy has laid upon us this law of labour—a law of necessity, but a law of love. He that looks up into the blue vault of heaven, and looks down upon the fair landscape beneath him, cannot repress some yearning desires to know more of these wonders than are revealed by the eye. The mind is not satisfied with what the eye can see. It would dive into the depths below, and rise into the heights above, and trace these wonders to their secret source and spring. And now, my friends, Almighty God, in giving us this enquiring mind, this spirit of intelligence, has placed us in the grandest field for carrying out these investigations. The laws of the heavenly bodies, the laws of motion, the laws of electricity, were the same when Adam left the Garden of Eden as they are at this moment; but how have they been made known to us? Not by inspiration, not by revelation, but by painstaking care, and close investigation, and long, laborious experiments, and the hard brain-work of men of science and men of thought and skill. God alone can create; but man can combine, can adapt. God said, "Let there be light;" but man, by patient investigation and toil, has been enabled to use these very rays of light—to concentrate, to convert them, as it were, into a marvellous artist for taking our portraits. What a wonderful triumph of man's labour and skill is that art of photography! Electricity, by patience and labour—this mighty force, by the art and skill of man, has been made to plate our spoons, draw our teeth—yes, this mighty giant has been brought into such complete subjection that, like an obedient servant, it carries our messages from pole to pole with lightning speed. What a triumph of man's skill is the electric telegraph! When we consider what has been thought out and done by the labour of men in various walks of life—when we consider what work the brain of one man has done, in putting thousands of working-men in motion, and giving them work to do—can we avoid coming to the conclusion that labour is a mighty blessing? But in giving us this law, God has extended to us his great mercy, and He has made it a general law, and a law of blessedness. And now, my friends, I dare say you will say, some of you, "Yes; it is all very well for you to talk to us about labour being such a blessing; why, some of us have to work very hard indeed, and then can scarcely obtain a living for our families and ourselves, whilst there are some people who do not work at all, but live in luxury and in idleness. How can you make that out, then, that the law of labour is a general law, and a law of love?" Well, my friends, I am not going to try to explain the doings of God, in his Providence and his ruling of this world. I can no more answer why He puts one man in this position, and another in another, than you can.

Well, my friends, as you do not seem very much inclined to hear what further I have to say, I will resume my seat.

THE LORD BISHOP OF MANCHESTER.

My Lord Archbishop, and good people of Sheffield,—I am very glad to be told, though I was not present to hear his grace's actual words, that the Archbishop of York did not indulge in that ordinary fallacy and platitude of calling himself a working-man. I believe, as the Bishop of Carlisle said, his grace works possibly in his way as hard as any of you, and I imagine it is for this reason he is so deeply and justly respected by you people of Sheffield. And I do not call myself, in my much humbler sphere, an idle man; but, at the same time, I will not speak of myself as a working-man in the same sense as that in which I address you. I am not going to speak merely pleasant words to you. There are some matters on which you, and I, and all interested in the well-being of the Church of England and the progress of social happiness among us, may do well to take counsel together. It is always a matter of great regret to me that at these Church Congresses the working-men cannot attend the ordinary discussions, but have a meeting specially reserved for themselves. I have been present, not at all, but at several of the discussions of this Congress, and at each of those at which I have been present, every one would, with myself, have been only too glad to know what were the feelings and opinions entertained on the subject by working-men. Yesterday, for instance, we were discussing the question of intemperance, and I am sorry to say that somehow or other, discussions on intemperance are apt to assume—I will not say what is an untruth, but a very partial truth—that intemperance is mainly prevalent, or very largely prevalent, among the working-men; while I do not believe myself the class of working-men are any whit more intemperate than any other class. I say, then, it would have been a matter of very great importance and value to us if we could have had some of you present on this platform that night, to tell us what are the conditions of your every-day lives, and to help us to give a practical shape to the benevolent and philanthropic, but not always very feasible schemes for checking intemperance which were suggested by various speakers. At one o'clock to-day I was present at the Atlas works to witness the rolling of an armour plate and the way in which Bessemer steel is produced, and I saw standing around those great mechanical operations a body of working men, who seemed to me full of intelligence, full of activity, and with their minds entirely devoted to the work which lay before them. And I asked the director of the company, who was at my side:—"Do you find that any large proportion of your men are intemperate?" and he said,—“We do not.” I was going to say unhappily, but I think on the whole, happily, because most men have a looking-glass in their cottages, either whole or in fragments, which they look into when they shave or brush their hair, and they must see there, as St. James said, what manner of men they are. Well then, happily, intemperance has its own way of writing itself sometimes very obviously on certain features of the face. I don't know how it is that some men, with prominent features very markedly characterised, can go about among their fellow men and assume that their fellow men will take them to be models of sobriety and virtue. As I look over this meeting I don't see many of those prominent features marked in the way I have spoken of; looking in your faces I should say you are a body of temperate, and, I might justly add, intelligent men. Then again, this morning, we had a discussion about the recreations which were legitimate to Christian men, and to what extent the Church can hold the right hand of fellowship, or, at least, the right hand of sympathy, with many public amusements of the day. There are, no doubt, many public amusements that, in their present state, cannot be reconciled with even the very lowest idea of the form and

strictness of the Christian life. I don't know whether the men of Sheffield spend much of their time in racing, betting, or amusements of that kind; but I think I have heard rumours of something of the kind. I have never exactly been able to satisfy my own mind what it is that precisely constitutes the *sin* of gambling, and why it is a wrong thing to make a bet. I remember that Dr. Newman, when he was in the Church of England, when he wrote those admirable sermons which still remain as his legacy to that Church—I remember that in one of these sermons he was led to discuss the morality of gambling, and I think the conclusion he arrived at, which may be the true one, was that the sin of gambling consists in having an inordinate affection for an earthly thing. No doubt that is part of the truth. Gambling does settle the affections inordinately on earthly things. I have said this sometimes to the people of Lancashire, who are fond of some amusements in themselves harmless. I don't know I ought to say if a man is fond of birds and animals, or should go out with a favourite dog, dressed in some smart clothes, for which he cares a great deal more than for his wife and children, that he is doing very wrong. Nor do I know that it is a great sin for a man to go out with a couple of pigeons, and throw them in the air to watch their flight; but I say these things are done in a way and a spirit that make them wrong. They should not be done on Sundays; generally a great deal of betting, and drinking and bad language goes along with them. When the betting taste is formed, the result is that a man gets into an infatuation, which leads him to spend the last shilling on objects of that kind. But, whether betting is to be called a sin or not, it is pregnant with consequences of the most significant character, from which we wish these classes were free. But this is no particular vice or fault of the working-man. I cannot say—though no one admires horses more than I do, and I think I know the points of a horse as well as a man who comes from a southern county dares to think he does in an assembly of Yorkshiremen,—I cannot say that the modern style of horse-racing, with all its accompaniments, commends itself to me as an element in our progress and development as a nation. You working-men, at any rate, are not the men who are the main supporters of the racecourse. Every class of society, I am afraid, is far too largely represented there, and therefore I don't like looking at these questions again merely from a working-man's point of view. Each class has its own difficulties and temptations. Then the question was discussed about the permissibility of Christian men going to the theatre. There was a good deal of difference of opinion on that point, and though the differences were vigorously expressed, yet it seemed to me that the underlying principle of most of us was much the same; and although we all deprecated many of the evils of the stage viewed as a caterer for the public taste, yet none of us were inclined to think that the theatre was in itself damnable, or a thing to be utterly abjured or renounced by a man as utterly irreconcilable with the Christian profession. Sometimes people say the lowest type of dramatic entertainment is the provision made in the penny gaffs and low theatres for the general mass of the people. I have got myself—I won't say into a great deal of trouble, but a good deal of severe criticism, for having once or twice said that I should recognise the stage as an instrument for improving and refining the people, if some of its conditions were improved. A Manchester gentleman, who knows pretty well how things go on in connection with the theatres in that city, told me distinctly that an audience of working-men and women were more severely critical of anything approaching to immorality and indecency on the stage, than the great mass of the people who were socially above them would be. He told me that a manager would hardly dare to put upon the stage, before an audience consisting mainly of working people, a drama after the French fashion, in which vice shall be gilded with meretricious attractiveness, and in which adultery and treachery and dishonourable conduct of all kinds shall come to a triumphant end. I am informed that the theatres in Man-

chester, which are mainly attended by the working classes, are the theatres which chiefly put upon the stage melo-dramas, no doubt of a stimulating and sensational character, but in which the upshot of the general effect is not vicious or indecent. Well, then, in this respect at least, you are a lesson to many of your betters. I therefore return to the point from which I started, that I wish some of you had been present at these discussions in order to have given a practical tone to our deliberations, for we wish to see in what way the Church, which is the living exponent of Christianity to the world, might best place itself in contact and sympathy with the world in order to make that world better, purer, and worthier. I want you to realize why it is we cannot help taking such a profound interest in you of the working classes. It is not because your souls are of more value than the souls of any other classes; it is simply that you are numerically the most important class; and when we remember that in our blessed Lord's time, "the common people heard Him gladly," while now though we find we can scarcely get the common people to come and hear us at all, it does seem as if some of our machinery were out of gear. These are some of the points we need to be enlightened about; and at one of these Congress working-men's meetings, I once expressed a wish that I and my clerical brethren were the audience, and some of you were the speakers, for I am sure, and I say it without the least wish to flatter, that we want to know what you have to tell us quite as much as you want to know what we have to tell you. A clergyman to-day, who knows Sheffield men pretty well, said to me, "Sheffield men are religious in their way." He did not explain what that way was, and I did not pretend to have the gift of insight, without actual knowledge, to guess what that way is. But I feel pretty confident of this, that many of you men have taken a dislike to the ordinary exposition of Christianity because it seems to be, as ordinarily explained, so far removed from your common ordinary daily temptations and trials, and you find, therefore, that you do not get much help out of your teachers. If that be so, I just want to bring before you, as plainly as I can, what seems to me at any rate to be the fundamental principles of Christianity. They are very few, and for the most part very simple. Men have multiplied them no doubt, and there are those who say that there are something like seven hundred theological propositions in the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England; and I suppose there are a great many more than seven hundred theological propositions in the Westminster Confession; and certainly there are in the dogmatic statements of the Church of Rome. When my Bible tells me that Christ came to make a simple way to heaven, in which a wayfaring man, though a fool, should not err; when we are told that He came to preach the gospel to the poor, and that the common people hung upon his words; when we read the practical utterances preserved in the 5th, 6th, and 7th chapters of St. Matthew, or even the deeper and more mysterious utterances in the upper chamber of Jerusalem, recorded in the gospel of St. John,—will any one attempt to persuade me that it is necessary for any man for the life of his soul to subscribe to seven hundred theological propositions? When men have lost all sense of proportion, sometimes that which is manifest and least important is made more of than the principle that covers and embraces all. When St. Paul would tell me what is the gospel I ought to preach if I would be a follower of him, he speaks of the two fundamental principles of repentance towards God and faith towards Christ, matters about which no living Christian man can well have two opinions; and it seems to me that it ought to be the great object of our teaching to bring men back to the simplicity which is in Christ Jesus, and to those rudimentary truths of holy living which all acknowledge even when they do not obey them. If, then, when you go to Church you do not get the food you require, if I were your minister I should consider it a kindness in you to come to me and say, "Sir, you are preaching rather over our heads; you use rather too fine words; we do not care very much

about those theological distinctions; we want to be brought close to Christ, and to learn what manner of men and women we ought to be." I am sorry to say that there is atheistic teaching in the land, and I know that the walls of Manchester are sometimes placarded with the announcement that some one will explain why he became an atheist, or why he ceased to believe in the Bible; but I was told to-day that that teaching does not find much favour in Sheffield. I see from the *National Reformer*, that Mr. Bradlaugh boasted the other day that there were 100,000 working-men who accepted his principles; but even supposing the statement to be free from exaggeration, what are they among the fifteen or twenty millions of working-men in the country? It is a mere drop in the bucket, and I confess I do not believe that atheistic opinions are acceptable to the working classes. You may sometimes hear it said that the clergy are afraid of science, and that we hold views which modern philosophy and investigation have scattered to the winds. It would be folly indeed if any body of men who aspire to teach others were afraid to encounter or accept any proved truth. I have that faith in the harmony of the works and of the revelation of God, that if I find any distinct proof that an interpretation which I have hitherto put upon the revealed word comes into contradiction with an ascertained truth of science, I do not feel bound to deny that ascertained truth of science. If I retained my rational intelligence I could not deny it. It would be against the very law of my mental being to do it. But what I do, on the other hand, is to say, "Oh! then I have had a mistaken interpretation of God's word." There was a time when people read the first chapter of the Book of Genesis in such a sense that they felt themselves compelled to believe that the world was made and ordered in the fashion in which we now see it, in six days of twenty-four hours each. Why the cosmogonic interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis has undergone a score of changes since that time, and even to-day we have no means of settling it on a sure foundation. But it seems to me, having given the best attention to the subject that I could command, that all the first chapter of Genesis is meant to teach me is, not that matter is eternal, not that things came into their being by spontaneous generation, not that the world is constructed by mechanism without a mechanic, but that it was Almighty God Who created and ordered the world and all things that are therein. It is true that modern science tells me that the idea of a personal God is an unverifiable hypothesis. To the man of science, as such, no doubt it is an unverifiable hypothesis. His telescopes, and microscopes, and spectroscopes cannot by any searching find out God. I quite admit that the man of science is perfectly justified in saying, "By my physical processes I cannot discover God. By anything outside me I cannot of itself discover God." But when a man sees what he can do with his own hand and with his own intellect, surely, then, we can understand somewhat of what the Bible means when it says man is an image of God, and, from what he finds himself capable of doing, projecting, as it were, that power into the infinity of space and time, he seems, in a measure, to realise the idea that this world did not come into its present shape without some architectonic and fashioning hand. When men of science are perfectly agreed as to the facts of science, and as to the legitimate inferences that can be drawn from those facts, then, perhaps, it will be time for us theologians—it won't make so much matter to us as teachers of practical religion—to set our house a little more in order than it is at present; for I admit there are elements of disorder in our house, and our systems are not so perfectly adjusted to the actual phenomena as one might desire to see them: but I say, till then—till the men of science are agreed, not only upon their facts, but upon their inferences from the facts, we, at least, who have to teach that simple faith of which I spoke—repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ—can afford to stand aside, and still do our work with the old faith in the Master's help being with us;

and waiting, and feeling sure that nothing will come out in the end that is not consistent with truth, and nobleness, and virtue. When I say that men of science are not all agreed, allow me to read what I think is about the latest utterance of a man of science, and, I believe, a man who is considered to stand pretty nearly at the top of the rank of the men of science of his school—I mean Professor Hæckel. At a dinner given to him the other day in Paris, by some French *savants*, he made a speech, which, we are told, was highly applauded, and this is the report of his speech, as given in the *Times* of a recent date:—"The continuity of nature," says Professor Hæckel, "is daily becoming more evident, and superstition, mysticism, and teleology" (that hard word means the supposition that there is a *purpose* in things being as they are) "will give way to reason, causality, and mechanism. The primitive life organisms were formed chemically"—of course the Professor was there to see—"by spontaneous generation at the bottom of the sea—like saline crystals in water. Nohow else," he says, "could the origin of life be explained—except by a perfectly arbitrary hypothesis, for which there is not the slightest foundation. The transformations of living organisms," he adds, "under the influence of adaptation, hereditary selection, and struggle for existence, could not, indeed, be mathematically demonstrated, but its existence could not be doubted any more than psychology or social science; and anomalies would soon be explained by the laws of mechanics, were all the elements procurable." This is the latest utterance of the most advanced evolutionist—that the world came into its present shape by mechanism, without a mechanic. You Sheffield men can judge of the possibility of that. I certainly did not see that the armour-plates which we saw to-day came into their present shape without some mechanic superintending the operation. According to this Professor, the origin of life can nohow else be explained, because the idea of God having anything to do with it is utterly excluded ex-hypothesi. Consequently, the origin of life "can no otherwise be explained." It must be supposed that life originated "by spontaneous generation as the result of chemical action at the bottom of the sea." Well, this is a pretty positive statement of Professor Hæckel. Well, I read the other day what was said by Dr. Virchow, at Munich, on this very subject, in an address, which has been subsequently published under the title of "The Freedom of Science in the Modern State." I do not pretend to be competent to speak of these matters of my own knowledge; the archbishop knows much more about them than I do. But I am informed that Dr. Virchow is one of the most eminent physiologists in Germany, and his reputation, I imagine, as an investigator is equal to that of Professor Hæckel. Well, then, Professor Virchow says:—"We cannot teach, we cannot pronounce it to be a conquest of science, that man descends from the ape, or from any other animal. We can only indicate it as an hypothesis." Well, it is a strange thing that men of science, who won't allow us theologians to have a single hypothesis, rest their conclusions entirely upon hypotheses, at least upon something which they admit cannot be mathematically demonstrated. "We can only indicate it," says the Professor, "as an hypothesis, however probable it may seem, and however obvious a solution it may appear." "Let us hope," he adds, "that men of science will not fail to examine this most serious question, whether the authority of science will not be better secured if it confines itself strictly to its own province, than if it undertakes to master the whole view of nature by the premature generalising of theoretical combinations." I only say I think that teachers of religion have a right, at present, to stand aside and say to the men of science:—"Gentlemen, we are all attention; we are waiting to see what you will prove; and when you have proved to me that I have no soul,—it may be an uncomfortable fact to know, but I must accept it if you can prove it; but must beg leave not to accept it as your hypothesis. When you prove to me that I have no

will, and that my actions, which I used to consider voluntary, are simply the reflex actions of a muscle or a nerve, when you prove that to me as being the normal condition of my being, I, who did once think, that being now minded to put out my right hand, that the putting it out was the result of my previous determination, shall be compelled to admit that I was mistaken, and that it was nothing but 'reflex action.' When you tell me that, in the long stages of evolutionary existence, my immediate progenitor was an anthropoid ape, and that the original source of organised life was spontaneous generation, the result of a chemical process at the bottom of the sea—when you *prove* that, I shall admit it, because I must admit it if it is truth. But until I am obliged to admit it I shall still say, that somehow or another, the hypothesis of a personal God, Who made the world and all things that therein are, seems to me still the more probable hypothesis." Professor Clifford tells us, with a kind of pride, "that the kingdom of man is at hand." I would welcome the advent of the kingdom of man in a Christian sense. I want to see Christianity more human. I want to see it less dealing with pictures of hell and heaven, and a little more with the difficulties and trials and temptations of this present life. I know very little about the world beyond the grave. I do not know as much as I wish to know about this world in which I am living and moving. I want to see Christianity a good deal more human than in these latter days it has been made to become. Christianity, in Christ's hands, was profoundly human, profoundly sympathetic, profoundly helpful. It was only now and then it threw aside the curtain and pictured to us the dark and unknown picture—a state of bliss equal to the angels,—no more death, and the like. Just now and then the curtain was, for a moment, drawn aside, and we were as it were permitted to see a few of the mysteries of the life of the world to come. But even then those revelations are veiled in language, the precise significance of which we cannot understand. I do not know what an angel is, therefore I cannot very well understand what is meant by "equal to an angel." I do not know what God is like: no human eyes have ever seen Him; and therefore I cannot pretend to say I understand what is meant when it is told me "I shall be like God." I believe, in some respects, I am like God now, in all the better portion of my nature, in all my highest thoughts, in all my noblest yearnings. If I am not like God, then what am I like? Surely not like the devil. I am reaching after truth and righteousness. Surely I have some strength, some force in me higher than my common self, when I am struggling, and struggling successfully, against temptation? I may not know what it is to be like God, but I seem to know, it is a truth written most plainly on my heart, that if I am reaching after whatever things are true, and just, and pure, and of good report, then, certainly, I am reaching after that image, at any rate, of the Redeemer, which He came in his love and compassion to set before the world. Professor Clifford says, in a striking article in the *Nineteenth Century*, that there is nothing left but to teach our children to be good. But if we have no souls to be saved, if there be no difference between good and evil, if no will to choose the better or worse, men are but playing with words when they first destroy all those solid foundations on which society has built itself up, and then talk about teaching people to be good. Physiologists tell me that everything material in me changes in seven years; but I feel myself the same man that lived and acted, and was responsible for his acts, 20, 30, 40 years ago. There may have been changes—I hope there may be still—for the better; but there is one conviction which never seems to vary: it is, that moral truth is a higher thing than speculative truth, that righteousness is a nobler and grander thing than orthodoxy, and that what we have to strive after is, if we can—and God helping us we can—to make the world happier and nobler, by making it better and purer.

The Most Rev. the PRESIDENT.

WE have still a few minutes remaining, and I am going to ask the Rev. Canon Ryle to address you.

Rev. Canon RYLE.

WHEN the Congress was held at Leeds, about six years ago, on the first day, somewhere about noon, a number of the clergy were walking about in the neighbourhood of the parish church. At the time, two working-men were putting down a new gas-pipe, and as they stood there and saw all the clergy coming past, one fellow said to the other :—" John, what's the meaning of all these parsons being about ? " and the reply was :—" Oh, Bill ; haven't you heard ? There's been a strike among the parsons." Well, my friends, when you look at the many parsons assembled this week in Sheffield, you may think that too. Allow me to tell you there is no strike at all. We are all of one heart and one mind, I believe, in loving the Church of England, in willingness to work for her, and desire to promote her best interests. There are certain people among us, I am afraid, who are tired of the Church of England as she is, and think that it may be altered and improved. Yet, I believe, the greater part of us who have come here this week are not tired of her service at all, but will stand together, side by side, and do their utmost to protect her to the very last breath they take. The time allotted to me is very short ; therefore, you will pardon me if I only make one or two practical remarks. Let me express an earnest hope that whatever goes on in the world at this present day, the world of thought, the world of writing, the world of mind, you will never lose your confidence in the cause of Christ and the truth of Christianity. You may hear many things that you cannot understand, many objections made that you cannot speak to. When you hear these things, study to be patient, wait quietly, be not easily moved. Professor Faraday, one of the most remarkable men that God has ever given of recent years—the famous chemist, no less famous as a Christian—used often to say that it was the highest wisdom to exercise a judicious suspense of judgment, and to wait and not to be moved because he could not give an answer to an objection. So I think it ought to be with us. A working cobbler at Bath used to have once a week a little gathering of people in a shed adjoining his shop, and read the Bible to them. Being a man not very much up in learning, if he came to a passage of Scripture which he could not explain, he used to say, " I think, my friends, we had better pass over that piece, and go on to something else we can understand. If we only wait a bit, we shall come to understand this bye-and-bye ; in the meantime, we will stick to what we can understand." After all, there are certain things in the Christian religion, depend upon it, which no one can possibly explain away. There are hard things, no doubt, which we cannot solve : the difficulties about the beginning of mankind—difficulties about the age of the world. But we may fall back upon facts that, after all, nobody can explain away. There is the great fact—our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ Himself. Let the infidels explain Him away if they can. He came into the world and lived a despised life for thirty-three years—without money, without armies, without rich followers. He preached the gospel, despised by nearly all, and was followed by no one but a few poor and humble followers. He died at length the death of a malefactor, being crucified between two thieves. Yet there remains the broad fact that cannot be explained—that neither Gibbon, nor Voltaire, nor Rousseau, nor Thomas Paine can account for—that He has made a mark upon the world which has never been obliterated to this day : which stands, indeed, as the deepest mark upon the history of mankind. Let the impugnors of Christianity explain away Christ if they can.

We only can explain Him who hold that He was the Son of God and the divine Redeemer of the world. Again, they cannot explain away the fact of the Bible being the book that it is. Here is a book, written by a few Jews, in a remote part of the world! Look what a book it is! how much it contains! how marvellous the things it tells us about the beginning of mankind, about the history of mankind, about human nature, about the way of pardon and forgiveness of sins, about the way to peace with God. What light it throws upon these subjects! I say they cannot explain away the Bible. It can only be explained by those who regard it as a book which came from God; who hold that those who wrote it were men inspired by God; and that when we read it we read the Word of God. Again, they cannot explain away results which Christianity has produced upon the face of the world. If you look back at what Rome or Greece was, or what any countries of the world were before the Lord Jesus Christ died upon the cross, and his disciples went out to preach the gospel, how wretched was the condition of mankind! how little morality existed! how little charity between man and man! what wretched darkness and ignorance brooded over the face of the earth! What changes the last eighteen hundred years have seen, through the introduction of Christianity! The world has become entirely altered, and different from what it was. If Christianity has effected all this, I ask you not to be moved by the attacks of infidels, and not to despair about Christianity. Let me add one other piece of advice. Let me hope you will never lose your confidence in the Church of England, and believe those who tell you that its days are numbered, and it will soon die. The old fable tells us that when two hunters went forth to kill the lion, they were discussing what they should do with its skin when it was killed. Some one advised them first to kill the lion, and then to talk about the skin. In the same way, I recommend people not to talk about what they will do with the cathedrals and the property of the Church of England until they prove that the Church of England is going to die. There was a time, no doubt, when the bishops and clergy did not know their duties, and the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ was not preached as it should have been. In those days bishops never came forth to meet the people in the way they have come forth to-night. I thank God that I have lived to see archbishop and bishops stand before a meeting like this, not afraid to meet the working-men of England face to face. Those were the days when John Wesley, and Charles Wesley, and George Whitfield were disgracefully driven out of the Church of England—not that they ever forsook her, or renounced intercourse with her, but because the bishops and clergy did not know their duties. Had they lived in these days, I do not doubt for a moment that the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of Manchester, and many other bishops, would have gladly welcomed Wesley and Whitfield with open arms. I grant we may have some divisions among us at present; you hear of our squabbles and our controversies much more than of our works and our unity. Now, I believe, as I ventured to tell his grace here to-day, that there is a vast amount of substantial unity among clergymen of the present day. High Church, and Low Church, and Broad Church, and Slow Church, and No Church, we are constantly hearing of; but there are a vast number of people inside the Church of England who are of one heart and of one mind. They love the same Bible and the same worship. They would not stand by and see her disestablished without making a good fight for her. I know there are men among us who do not like the Church of England, who are always quarrelling with their bread and butter. They want a little more of this, and a little more of that, and a little less of the other. Well, if they prefer the Church of Rome why don't they go there? Perhaps, if they joined the Church of Rome, they would be far happier than they are now. They would not be so sat upon as they are sometimes by the archbishops and bishops. They would probably find that they had exchanged into a

worse place. After all, I am of opinion that our own differences do us a great deal of good. I believe were all entirely of one mind, were all to blow the same note on the same instruments, we in the Church of England should not make as good music as we do now. Out of the collision of flint and steel you get sparks, and out of our own collisions you get in the long-run good results in the cause of truth. I often think of what occurred on one occasion when the famous Dr. Johnson was dining at the table of a certain bishop. There happened to be a very large party, who were talking over the virtues of a certain couple, who had never differed for a moment—never had a quarrel. One person said, "How nice!" Another said, "How beautiful!" Dr. Johnson sat silent and said nothing at all. At last the lady of the house said, "Dr. Johnson, what do you think?" "Madam," said he, "I think it must have been mightily flat!" Well, now, I firmly believe, though I am an out-and-out Evangelical, that out of our divisions good comes in the long-run. One of the great subjects we have had discussed this week has been the grand cause of temperance. Let me express my earnest hope that all who love the Church of England, who desire her prosperity, will contend earnestly against the cause of intemperance, which is the curse of our day. So also I hope that you will stand side by side, and fight to the very last for the good old English Sunday. We do not want to have an Italian Sunday, or a German Sunday, or any other kind of undomestic Sunday; but let us have the old English Sunday as long as the world stands. Above all, let me press on you the great duty of cultivating brotherly kindness and avoiding quarrels. There was once a Dissenting community in which division sprang up, and threatened to rend the congregation in twain. At last the people resolved to ask advice from a Dissenting minister who lived some little way off, but who had a farm in the parish where the Dissenting chapel was. They put before him the state of affairs, and waited anxiously for his reply. It happened that the very same day the bailiff on his farm wrote to the old minister to ask his advice about certain agricultural matters. The old minister wrote an appropriate reply to each, but unfortunately when he came to write the direction, he directed the letter to the bailiff which should have gone to the chapel, and the letter to the chapel which should have gone to the bailiff. Well, upon a certain day the congregation met together, and the letter was opened and read with great solemnity. The Chairman looked and paused. They said, "What's the matter?" "Well," he said, "our friend has written a very strange letter; but," he added, "we know that our friend doth sometimes speak parables, and he may be writing a parable." The letter was as follows:—"My dear friend,—With respect to the matter about which you ask my advice, all I have got to say is this: you must make up your gaps and your fences." "Well," said the reader, "this means that we are to make up our divisions,"—"and," went on the letter, "mind you take care of the old red bull." "Oh!" said the chairman, after they had all stared at one another in bewilderment, "We know that Satan is called in the scriptures, 'the old red dragon,' and 'Lucifer,' and by that 'old red bull' he means 'the devil.'" Well, then, I say, let us likewise beware of the old red bull. Whatever we do let us beware of causeless quarrels and divisions. Let us follow after unity, peace, and concord with all men. Let us make up gaps as soon as we see them. So doing, we shall help the cause of Christ in the world, promote our own comfort, and keep at a distance our great enemy the devil.

His Worship the MAYOR OF SHEFFIELD.

I WANT you to do your duty when we find such men as the Lord Archbishop coming to us and telling the truths he has done this night, and giving his advice plainly and straightforwardly, without fear of what the consequences may be. He is not afraid of displeasing any of you. He tells us that if we want to be happy men, we must deny ourselves and follow the principles of Jesus Christ. The Bishop of Carlisle has given us a very interesting and happy speech. He has told us what we should understand by being good men, good Churchmen, and good Englishmen; he has told us to live as Englishmen, and I hope we shall do so. The Bishop of Manchester, with his brother bishops, was ready to come amongst us, and he tells us how we want to be brought nearer to Christ. Now, my fellow-townsmen, when we have the archbishop and the bishops and clergy coming here and giving us the advice they have this evening, I am sure we must all be truly grateful and return them our thanks for what they are doing. I am very proud to see so many of my townsmen here to-night, and I am sure we cannot have been here without learning and profiting much for the future. Therefore, I ask you to return your hearty and sincere thanks to the Lord Archbishop, the bishops, and the clergy who have been here and done such good work for us during this week.

The Most Rev. the PRESIDENT.

THERE has been an exhibition of two homely virtues in this hall to-night. There has been a great deal of courage on this platform, and a great deal of patience in the body of the hall. The courage on the platform is very great, for I must say that, after some experience, I never before faced such a meeting as this; and I am sorry to say that one stranger here amongst us, whom we won't treat as a stranger, positively declined to fulfil his intention of rising to address you, because he never saw such a meeting before. You lost by that, but I hope that some day or other he will come here again and will face the meeting and will address you. Then, with regard to the patience shown on your side, I must say this, that it often occurred to me that some of the things into which we plunged were rather deep; and I became a little alarmed when my friend the Bishop of Manchester took us over the whole field of science at an easy hand-gallop. But I saw to my surprise that every face in the hall was lit up with intelligent animation, and that you were quite conversant with these things in a general way. The evening has in that way been a most happy and prosperous one; and I hope I may humbly claim for myself and the other speakers that we have come to understand you better, and you understand us rather better, and we go away better friends than before. As for the reception that you have given me to-night, I must humbly and sincerely thank you, and I can hardly express to you how deeply and truly I feel those words when I say, "I thank you."

OVERFLOW MEETING OF WORKING MEN.

THE interest taken by the working-men of Sheffield in the meeting specially provided for them was so great, and the demand for admission so large, that an overflow meeting was held at the same time

in St. Paul's Lecture Hall, which was crowded to excess. The Chair was occupied by the Venerable W. EMERY, B.D., Archdeacon of Ely; and the Bishops of Carlisle, Manchester, and Sodor and Man, and the Revs. Canon Ryle and Canon Tristram addressed the meeting.

CUTLERS' HALL. THURSDAY MORNING,

OCTOBER 3rd, 1878.

His Worship the MAYOR OF SHEFFIELD took the Chair
at 10 A.M.

PAROCHIAL CHURCH COUNCILS.

(a.)—IS THEIR INSTITUTION DESIRABLE?

(b.)—IF SO, HOW SHOULD THEY BE ELECTED?

(c.)—WITH WHAT POWERS SHOULD THEY BE INVESTED?

PAPERS.

Mr. HENRY STEPHENSON, Sheffield.

By a Parochial Church Council, I understand a small number of persons appointed by parishioners to assist the incumbent in the regulation in his parish of various details of church work and worship not prescribed by statute or rubric.

It will be observed that our subject is perfectly distinct from the much larger question of the admission of the laity to convocation, or to any control over the doctrine and discipline of the Church. It relates specially to congregational work and worship.

Our first duty is to enquire, Is the appointment of such bodies desirable? I answer: their appointment is desirable in those parishes where the parishioners desire them; and principally for the following reasons:—

First.—As a means of stimulating congregational life and intelligent co-operation in congregational duties.

It is not too much to say that our present parochial organization is pure imperialism. The clergyman originates, directs, prohibits or neglects at his will and pleasure; advice or help is tendered only by permission and on sufferance; and, alone among public servants, he is practically under hardly any other restraint than that of public opinion.

Now when the incumbent is an exceptionally good and able man, the immediate result may leave little to object to; but when the reverse is the case, or when the clergyman is able but wrong-headed,

or well-intended but weak, the consequences are mischievous and sometimes disastrous; and in any case the church is deprived of the benefit of intelligent participation in her work by her members. Following the analogy suggested by the organization of her sister institution, the State, may we not infer that it would be wise to lay aside imperialism in parishes as well as in nations, and to adopt in its stead a limited monarchy? May we not expect that a body of representatives which under the guidance of the minister might be the source and centre of church life and action in his parish, would add strength to the Church by enlisting in her service a hearty co-operation and an intelligent interest which our present organization repels? and may we not attribute the success of Wesleyanism, a system which originally differed little from our own except in this matter of lay agency and its more elastic services, mainly to its recognition of this principle? I am tempted to quote the emphatic words of the Rev. Canon Ryle: "Some men reply coolly that the laity may become lay agents and scripture readers, may even exhort and give little addresses, may teach Sunday schools and be parochial visitors, may attend committees and superintend church finance. My answer is that all those suggestions are ridiculously below the mark, and I marvel that sensible men have the face to make them. The reform I plead for is the general recognition of the mighty principle that the laity ought to have a part, a voice, and hand, and vote in everything that the Church says and does, except ordaining and ministering in the congregation."

If however it is objected that divided authority would lessen the clergyman's responsibility, my answer is it would simply alter its direction. Instead of being exercised in judging and deciding for the congregation, its sphere would lie in helping the congregation to judge and decide wisely for itself.

Secondly.—The institution of parochial councils is desirable as a protection to congregations against changes in the mode and manner of conducting public worship which they disapprove, and as a means of introducing changes they desire.

Great latitude is wisely permitted in the conduct of the public services of the Church. But whose tastes ought chiefly to determine the direction of this latitude—those of the individual, or of the congregation? At present, a young clergyman is appointed to a parish where he thinks the services tame and old-fashioned. He may discard the old hymns, revolutionize the choir and the general arrangements of the church, and finally set the parish by the ears. Or, a clergyman with strong sympathies in the opposite direction is introduced to a benefice where the congregation has been accustomed to an ornate service. Its habits will probably be disregarded, and in this case as in the other its prayers and praises bid to follow the orders of the new incumbent. Or a congregation has a minister obstinately opposed to all changes, who sees danger in every departure from the old paths. As a consequence, many of his flock may wander to other shepherds, and those who remain may be petrified by the lifeless routine. Or to take smaller instances, who has not felt the indignity of the hymn-book being changed without the sanction of the con-

gregation, or of the Psalms, for example, being persistently read instead of chanted, or *vice versa*, as the case may be, in opposition to the congregation's known wishes? Surely there can be but one opinion: that the services ought to be conducted in that form within the allowed limits which is most agreeable to the worshippers, and that such a change in the law as will give effect to this principle is urgently required.

But, thirdly.—If Parochial councils are desirable as a protection to parishioners against the clergy, they are equally desirable as a protection to the clergy against themselves.

How few amongst us are not personally deteriorated by the possession of arbitrary power! Not only does it too often induce an uncunctious demeanour and a temper impatient of opposition; it also exposes the holder to the constant temptation or suspicion of yielding to the caprices of rich, or powerful, or favourite parishioners to the neglect of the wishes of the humbler majority. Ought not then the conscientious incumbent to welcome the appointment of a representative body which will protect him from these dangers, by relieving him from the inconvenient and invidious office of sole arbiter in every contention?

Let no one suppose it is desired to diminish the just influence of the clergy. Their influence would be not the less real by being less obtrusive, and as men often yield to persuasion what they refuse to force, the judicious minister would exercise a moral power through and by means of a parochial council not less effective than the legal power with which he is now invested.

It will probably, however, be objected by many persons who sympathise to a certain extent with the foregoing observations that a sufficient remedy for the evils we have been considering would be found in voluntary councils, formed by mutual arrangement between the incumbent and his congregation, rather than in legally constituted bodies, such as it will have been apparent I am contemplating. To such objectors I respectfully submit—

First.—That the consent of the incumbent to the formation of a council would most probably be withheld in those parishes where a council was most needed, or, if a council were appointed in such a parish, its advice would be seldom asked or little heeded.

Secondly.—That as men do not often volunteer the surrender of authority in matters of importance, it is natural to expect that the matters entrusted to the discretion of the council, or on which it would be even consulted, would, in most parishes, be too trivial to enlist the active interest of practical men whose time was of value.

Thirdly.—That the illusory character of councils possessing no inherent authority or responsibility, and consulted only on the most trivial questions, would deprive such bodies of the weight and influence which are necessary to secure the ends for which their appointment is desired.

And Fourthly.—That the laity would still remain suppliants for that which they may reasonably claim as a right.

In confirmation of these views, I may appeal to the experience of all persons who are acquainted with the practical working of the

voluntary councils now in operation in a large number of parishes, at least in this part of the country, whether it is not an indisputable fact that, however valuable these experiments may be as a preparation for a system of self-government, they exercise generally no appreciable influence on congregational affairs; that they are seldom consulted on the questions on which the congregation is the most interested or on which its sentiments are likely to differ from those of the incumbent, and that they, consequently, fail to secure for the laity their just influence and control.

I must also call attention to the fact that the policy of legalising parochial church councils has been expressly affirmed by the House of Commons, after full debate, on the two occasions when Lord Sandon has introduced his bill for this object, and that it enlisted the powerful advocacy of two other leading members of the present Cabinet—Mr. Cross and Mr. W. H. Smith.

If, then, in the course of the present discussion, any opinions adverse to parochial councils should be expressed which are drawn from past experience of their working, I shall gladly welcome such support to the position I am maintaining, namely, that voluntary councils, unless established under circumstances too favourable to be generally hoped for, will naturally end in confusion and failure.

In entering upon the next branch of our subject, the mode of election, we have first to consider who shall be the electors—the constituency which appoints the churchwardens, that is, the parishioners generally, or those parishioners only who worship at the parish church?

The two pioneers in this movement, Lord Sandon and the Hon. and Rev. W. H. Fremantle, the one in the valuable bill to which I have referred, the other in his no less admirable pamphlet (from both of which I have freely borrowed in the preparation of this paper) concur in proposing the larger body, but impose such conditions as to the persons eligible for election, that I believe the result would, in most cases, be the same as if the electors consisted only of those parishioners who were members of the congregation.

Many earnest Churchmen, however, feel strongly the incongruity of allowing persons of all communions, or of no communion, to take part in electing a body which is to be strictly a "*Church Council*;" but I must remind them of the difficulty of defining with the requisite legal precision what constitutes a "member of the congregation," and that if it were surmounted, which I think is not impossible, the objection would remain that all previous legislation connected with the Church of England has recognised every parishioner as a member who does not exclude himself; and any attempt to legislate on new lines, especially when those lines are confessedly difficult to define, would be certain to meet with powerful opposition. I must also suggest another consideration. The services and ministrations at the parish church may have been so conducted as to have driven away many of the parishioners, and if they were debarred on this account from taking part in the election, the control would probably fall more and more into the hands of a clique, and improvement would be rendered more difficult.

Yielding to these reasons, I agree in thinking that the wisest course is to entrust the election to the whole body of parishioners ; but as the point at issue does not affect either the reasons for parochial councils or the general details, I propose, in deference to the very natural feeling to which I have referred and which found full expression in Parliament, to treat it as an open question, deserving full discussion and consideration, but which does not press for present settlement. Let it, therefore, be understood, that whenever in the course of this paper I speak of parishioners, the term may be applied, if the hearer prefers, in the restricted sense I have indicated, and other corresponding modifications introduced into the scheme without affecting its general character.

Now supposing that at a meeting duly constituted and convened by the churchwardens, in pursuance of a requisition from a certain number of parishioners, it has been decided by a majority of those present to establish a parochial council, I propose—

1.—That a further meeting should be called to elect the members, but that they should in future be appointed at the same meeting as the churchwardens. I suggest that one-third of the council should retire in rotation annually, but should be eligible for re-election ; and I agree with Lord Sandon's suggestion, that the members should be called the sidesmen of the parish.

2.—That the incumbent and churchwardens for the time being should be *ex officio* members and ineligible for election ; the incumbent being chairman, with a second or casting vote.

3.—That any curates or other clergymen duly appointed to assist the incumbent should also be *ex officio* members, but without votes.

4.—That, in addition, the council should consist of eighteen persons in parishes having a population of 5,000 or upwards ; a less number in smaller parishes. Probably three persons in addition to the *ex officio* members would be as many as the smallest class of parishes could appoint with advantage.

5.—That every member, within a stated period after his election, should sign a declaration that he is a member of the Church of England (although not necessarily a parishioner), and that he undertakes to be a regular worshipper at the church on whose council he has been elected, unless prevented by sickness, absence from home, or other unavoidable cause. Any vacancies occasioned by failure to comply with these conditions, or by other causes, to be filled up by the council.

6.—That if, within a specified date previous to any new election, the churchwardens are duly requested to call a meeting to consider the expediency of discontinuing the council, it should be their duty to do so ; and if a majority of parishioners present shall so determine, no fresh election should take place, and the council should be discontinued.

I have now finally to speak of the powers with which parochial councils should be invested. I propose—

1.—That the council should have power to allow or make changes within the legal limits in the manner of conducting the services and ministrations of the Church, or in its ornaments and decorations, if

such changes are approved by two-thirds of the council, and that no changes should be lawful without such approval. If the incumbent object to any change which has been thus approved, it should not be carried into effect until it has been confirmed in a similar manner at the following meeting of the council, and finally by the bishop, when the incumbent should be bound to comply.

2.—That no offertories, except the usual legal offertories, should be collected for any object of which the council disapproves.

3.—That the council should have power to discuss any matters connected with Church work and worship in the parish; and also, with the consent of the incumbent, to undertake duties of this character.

I may add the suggestion, that in case the proposal should some day be adopted that a veto upon presentations to benefices and exchanges be given to parishioners, a parochial council would evidently be a most convenient body to be invested with this power.

It is now time I brought this paper to a conclusion. I hope it has been made apparent that parochial Church councils, constituted on the basis I have recommended, are well calculated to supply one of the greatest and most widely recognised defects of our parochial machinery, and also that they are capable of being welded into it without strain or derangement of other parts. Although I do not pretend the incumbent might never meet with unreasonable opposition from his council, or that its powers would always be used with perfect discretion, I submit the risk is only that which attends all free institutions, and is to be less dreaded than torpor and sullen discontent; while in the case of a parish, it would be exceptionally diminished by the opportunities, public and private, which the minister enjoys of influencing the feelings and judgment of his parishioners. And I cannot forbear asking whether the special circumstances of our time, its political no less than its theological controversies, its eager search for the weak points in our ecclesiastical harness, its scant reverence for ancient forms and merely personal authority, do not warn us of the need, even if at some sacrifice of individual dignity, to rid at least the parochial organization of the Church of offensive anomalies, to leave the least possible room for self-assertion either by vicar or powerful parishioner, to find work to attract and satisfy the intelligence and zeal of her best members, and to train them betimes in the practice of that self-government which has long prevailed in our other institutions?

Fully conceding, however, that there are many parishes to which, from a variety of causes, Church councils may be unsuited, it will have been noticed it is proposed to force a council on no parish which has not deliberately asked for one; while power is given to every parish to disburden itself of its council, if having tried the experiment it repents of its decision. Finally, suffer me to remark, that although in a paper limited to twenty minutes I have found it impossible to supply every detail or anticipate every objection, yet it is as a whole that any scheme of this nature must be approved or condemned, and however open to criticism it may be in this particular

or the other, I trust it will be admitted that these proposals have been framed in a spirit of moderation and prudence; that while identical in principle with the bill which has twice received the general approval of the House of Commons, and of some of the most trusted members of the present and preceding Governments, they are free from most of the objections which were urged against various details of that measure, and I venture to express the hope that they will not have been submitted in vain.

Rev. S. EARNSHAW, Sheffield.

THESE are eminently practical questions, which would be best handled by an incumbent of large and varied experience in parochial arrangements. When, therefore, the committee placed them in my hands, who have had no such experience, I could not but suppose that nothing more was expected of me than a treatment of the general subject of Church councils on abstract or theoretical principles apart from experiential details. This, therefore, is what I shall attempt, aiming to come at general results, rather than at particular rules for practice. Yet I am conscious of the comparative inutility of discussing a practical subject on theoretical principles; but in my defence I must remind you that theory is not seldom a most useful precursor and guide, by bringing into prominence principles and consequences which, though they may probably need the pruning knife of expediency before they are acted on, ought nevertheless not to be lost sight of by practical reformers.

I shall treat the subject of Church councils in a conservative spirit, *i.e.* with a sincere desire to conserve our Church as the Established Church of the Nation, believing that this is for the best welfare of the nation itself. In this spirit I shall advise what appear to me to be needful concessions and re-adjustments, for I am strongly of opinion that Church-conservatism, in the only sense in which it is rational, is not an obstinate aversion from all change, but such a willingness to make changes as combines respect for ancient institutions with a ready response to the necessities of adaptation and reform. Such conservatism is the Church's real strength, for a Church which shews due respect to the needful rights of the people will be able to rely safely on the people, both for obedience to her behests and for support in the time of danger.

The institution of parochial Church councils appears to me very desirable, for the following among many other reasons which might be assigned did time allow:—

1. It appears from Scripture that the laity of a parish have an indefeasible right to at least an equal share of power with their minister in the regulation and administration of all the concerns of their Church. There is also in the lay mind a growing conviction that the services in a parish church were originally designed for the benefit of all the parishioners who choose to avail

themselves of them ; to whom, therefore, they ought to be made edifying and suitable as far as possible.

2. The laity have observed, and experienced too, that though religious forms and ceremonies are not spirit and life, they are very conducive thereto, and act on individuals of certain temperaments with great force, rendering the ritual and mode of worship in a parish church a matter of great concernment. The laity think, therefore, that there ought to exist means whereby such things may be from time to time adapted to the varying spiritual needs and special circumstances of the people for whose use and benefit they are intended.

3. At present the whole power of making changes and adaptations in any parish church appears to be practically lodged in the hands of one individual, the incumbent, whom recent circumstances have shewn to be nearly, if not altogether, irresponsible for the use he makes of it ; the consequence of which is, that parishioners have to worship in their parish church after this or that type of ritual and service, and to change from this to that hymn book, and to drop this ceremony and take up that, at the arbitrary bidding of one who was appointed to minister to them and not to lord it over them. The consequence of this is, that if any of them through strong convictions of their own find themselves unable to join with a quiet conscience in the new manner of worship, no course is left open to them but this,—they must either worship under the continual annoyance of rites and ceremonies, and sing hymns, against which the spirit within them is all the while indignantly and vehemently protesting, or they must leave their parish church and find for themselves elsewhere a ritual and service which shall not outrage their conscientious convictions. Conservatism says this evil demands a remedy, and that the Church should provide one without loss of time. I advocate the institution of Church councils as likely to be an adequate remedy for this evil, if legally constituted with proper powers ; for without the possession of legal powers Church councils would necessarily soon sink into insignificance and become obsolete.

I will now endeavour to support these opinions by an examination of the consequences which seem to me to flow out of that one peculiarity of our Church which distinguishes her from all the other churches of Christ which exist in this country, viz., that to her the State has entrusted the spiritual welfare of all its people, by establishing her as the one Church of the whole nation.

This immense charge our Church long since accepted, and still accepts, notwithstanding that she has to work under the restraints of a singularly rigid system enforced upon her by an Act of Uniformity that knows no pity for scrupulous and weak consciences, and that was specially framed with a contempt of all those disturbing forces and all those changes of men and their environments which time and education and a thousand other things necessarily bring with them. A greater responsibility can hardly be imagined than that of a Church which has solemnly undertaken to be the only Church of a whole nation of intelligent, educated, thinking people. This is what our Church has undertaken to be ; and we are to take notice that in doing

so she placed herself under a distinct set of obligations to the State, from which, as an independent Church, she would be free. In return, and by way of compensation for this partial loss of liberty, she received from the State certain privileges and advantages which she desires not to lose; and it is to be kept in mind, in discussing her behaviour towards the nation, that the duties she owes to it are not always identical with those which were assigned to the primitive churches by her Divine Master and His Apostles; and hence there is needed on both sides a sincere spirit of forbearance and a willingness to make the best of things. The laity ought not to be too exacting towards the Church; nor the Church too high-minded and stiff towards the laity. Yet one result is clearly to be seen,—the Church, being the nation's only church, is bound to perform her duties to the satisfaction of the State in respect of every matter included in her compact with the State. Hence, if any of her servants (her parochial ministers, to wit) desire to exercise an autocratic power over the services of their churches, they are right in their logic when they demand the separation of Church and State, for ministerial autocracy is not compatible with conflicting lay rights. The preservation of the Church's nationality demands, therefore, that there shall be existing means of preserving and giving effect to lay rights in all parish churches.

Again, our Church, being the nation's only Church, is bound to conduct all her operations with an eye to that fact. She has, therefore, to justify her position by acting on a plan suitable to the work she has to do, and on a scale commensurate with the multifarious religious needs of so vast a charge. National comprehension she must aim at with a sincere endeavour, or confess unworthiness of her high position. A Church that has undertaken to be every man's Church within the broad limits of her Divine Master's commission cannot, without incurring deserved blame, suffer any servant of hers to drive away any of her flock from their parochial fold by the misuse of an arbitrary power which she unwisely leaves in his hands. Having been charged by her Master, and having agreed with the nation, to feed all comers with food convenient for them, she must use every means within her power to do so; and if through her own neglect of the needful means she fails to do so, she will have no just ground of complaint if the laity call upon her to shew cause why she should not cease to be the nation's only Church. I am of opinion that she would greatly extend her sphere of usefulness and secure her national position by consenting to entrust the power of making certain changes in the details of public worship to the minister, acting with the concurrence of a parochial and legally constituted Church council. If the people are to take an interest in the well-being of their Church they must be entrusted with some portion of real power in its management.

Again, our Church holding the position of the nation's only Church is thereby bound to provide, as far as she can, suitable worship for persons of every variety of religious temperament and emotional susceptibility, for in these respects human beings unavoidably differ greatly from one another. The Church of former days seems to

have overlooked this very important diversity of men's emotional constitution ; or if she did notice it we find no provision for it except that at her instance the State required all its people to attend the services of its own Church under certain pains and penalties. This however is not the way in which the Church can fulfil her divine mission in these days. The diversity of emotional constitution is and ever will be a difficulty to be surmounted by opportune concessions, adaptations, and comprehensive action ; and it points directly to a principle which cannot be too clearly seen by the governing authorities of our Church, that a church's nationality is not compatible with the maintenance of a rigid uniformity of congregational ritual and service. We all know that the more a man is in earnest, the more will he be under the influence of strong feeling ; and therefore in every congregation of earnest Christian worshippers there will unavoidably exist more or less of strong feeling in respect to any and every change in things of general concernment. This feeling it is obviously not desirable to put down with a high hand, because of its close connection with sincerity and truth. How then is the one Church of the Nation to deal with this phase of human diversity ? It would be vain to attempt to satisfy the scruples of individuals ; "*Quot homines tot sententiæ*" is against such an attempt ; and we are therefore obliged to have recourse to the usual expedient by referring all matters of congregational disquietude for settlement to the persons likely to feel most interest in them and know most about them,—the minister acting with a parochial Church council. And their decision is most likely to be accepted as satisfactory by all parties when the council has legal powers, and has been so chosen as to be properly representative of the people who have a real interest in them.

One obvious objection to this plan is, that it gives to individual parish churches too much independence and too wide a margin for diversity. To this we reply that when the Head of the Universal Church said, "*Wheresoever two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them,*" by those words He constituted each congregation entirely independent of every other congregation in the matter of ritual and service. One thing He required of every congregation, and by that one thing willed different congregations to be united : and that bond of Christian union He thus expressed—"*meet together in my name.*" Whatever that may mean, it does not mean identity of ritual and service in different congregations ; and besides there are many congregations of men outside our Church, who meet together in the name of Him who is their Lord and our Lord, and who have also received the Spirit of promise as well as we, and yet they are not one with us in the details of their worship and ritual. However much, therefore, perfect uniformity of ritual and service may commend itself to some minds, a congregation of men that habitually assemble in one place (i.e. a parochial congregation) has nothing to fear as to whether God will grant their requests and their Lord accept their service if Jesus be in their midst ; and we have his own promise that He will be in the midst of them whenever they are gathered together in His name. Hence it is not the right

way which a national Church takes when it seeks to preserve its oneness by insisting on perfect uniformity of ritual and service in all its parish churches. It was therefore a wise and just spirit by which our archbishops and bishops were actuated when on a recent occasion they consented to put forth a public announcement, that the Church of England, while she deprecates useless diversities, does not demand a rigid uniformity. This is a step in the right direction; and consistency requires that it should be followed by a corresponding modification or repeal of the Act of Uniformity. The Head of the universal Church has made congregations free by telling us that every parish church belongs to Him, and is an integral part of His Church, if the worshippers meet in His name. He has given them liberty to worship with a ritual convenient for them so long as they worship in spirit and in truth. If our Church could see her way to accord to all true Christians and especially to her own churches this liberty wherewith Christ has made his people free, she might then have a communion and fellowship with that large body of Nonconformists who, equal to herself numerically, are at present outside her Christian sympathies. By enlisting their co-operation she would be able to bring the religious mind of the nation so far under her influence as to justify the State in maintaining her as the Nation's one Church. Under properly devised checks against the inroads of that licentiousness which is apt to grow out of liberty, the present stringency of uniformity might be safely relaxed, and then the Church would be the Church of the Nation in deed as well as in name, and attain dimensions which at present seem beyond her aspirations as well as beyond her powers of comprehension.

Another objection to the institution of parochial Church councils with legal powers to act with the minister is this:—The regulation of the concernments of parish churches has been so long under the practically irresponsible power of the clergy that the opinion is well nigh universal that a legal division of this power with a lay council would be an improper, and even an unholy, interference with the rights of the clergy. Now in 2 Cor. iv. 5, St Paul has recorded his view of the political relation that should exist between ministers and their people, in words which may be translated thus,—“We preach a lordship of Jesus Christ, not of ourselves; ourselves we preach as your servants for Jesus' sake;” from which we may infer that the apostle desired herein to renounce lordship both for himself and all Christian ministers. In fact he here teaches in exact accordance with what he says in another place, that though in heathendom there be lords many, in christendom there is but one, the Lord Jesus. The proper title of a Christian minister is therefore, “your servant for Christ's sake;” but so unpalatable has this title been from the beginning to those whose glory it ought to have been, that the apostles soon found it needful to issue specific injunctions such as these,—“Be not ye called master, for One is your Master even Christ;” “Be not many masters;” “Do not deport yourselves like lords;” and to remind them of Him Who had said,—“I am among you as one that serveth.”

Again, if we seek in the New Testament for information respect-

ing the political relation between the minister and people in what was really the primitive Church, we find the apostles saying to the laity of the churches of which they were themselves at that time the only ministers,—“Choose ye, and we will appoint ;” and on this principle they seem always to have acted. Thus we have apostolic authority for an equal division of Church government between ministers and their people. And on the part of the people, it is not too much to expect of them that they will be willing and ready to conform to such injunctions as these which the apostles have specially addressed to them : “Obey them that have the rule over you ;” “Let every soul be subject to the higher powers ;” “Let every thing be done decently and in order ;” “God is not the author of confusion, but of peace in all the churches of the saints.”

I have said that our Church by accepting nationality from the State made herself responsible to the State in reference to all matters included in her compact: but this notion has always been an unwelcome one to the clergy ; and, as is well-known, there are at this present some of her ministers who regard the rights of the State, when exercised in restraint of their free action, as a burden too grievous to be borne. With these I have no sympathy, for the grievance (if it be one) is part of the original compact, and must be borne by every member of the clerical body who by the acceptance of the cure of souls voluntarily came under the compact as a party to its fulfilment.

Thus the first of our three questions is answered in the affirmative. On the two remaining questions I shall speak but briefly for the reason already alleged.

A parochial Church council, to satisfy these times and the just demands of lay rights, should consist of adult laymen who are communicant members of the congregation of the parish church. And the electors of the council should be such adult lay parishioners only as are reputed Churchmen, willing (if required) to declare themselves *bona-fide* members of the Church of England.

By a communicant member of the parish congregation is meant a person who ordinarily worships there, and who within the preceding twelve months has complied with the following rubrical regulation of the Church,—“Every parishioner shall communicate at least three times in the year, of which Easter shall be one.”

The powers to be conferred by law on a parochial Church council ought to include the following principle :—The minister of a parish church shall have no power whatever to introduce unaccustomed rites and ceremonies, nor to make any change of any kind whatever in the manner of conducting the public services, or in the services themselves, without the unanimous written consent of the parochial Church council first obtained thereto.

Nevertheless when the minister and council have agreed together in any matter of change in the concerns of their church, there shall be reserved to the National Church, acting in this case by and through the bishop of the diocese and his lay council, the supreme power of summarily intervening so far as may be necessary for the preservation of dogmatic truth and order, but no farther.

When there shall be a vacancy of the living, the parochial Church council shall be ready if required by the patron to assist him in his duty : and no person shall be appointed to the living unless at the least three-fourths of the whole council have previously in writing expressed and given to the bishop of the diocese their consent to his appointment.

Lapsed livings shall be filled by the bishop of the diocese with consent of a majority of his lay council. But it shall not be lawful for them to appoint any of the nominees of the patron ; nor in this case shall the consent of the parochial council be deemed necessary to the appointment.

ADDRESSES.

The Hon. and Rev. W. H. FREMANTLE.

IT is very undesirable that, in the present stage of this question, we should lose ourselves in details. It is sometimes said that the bane of Church Congresses is that they talk without result ; and until action is imminent it is useless to debate details. But what we may hope to do is to convince men of the general principle on which parochial councils are advocated, and to show that the action which is proposed is reasonable and practicable. It is necessary, perhaps, as a matter of intellectual honesty and to avoid the futility which waits on vagueness, to enter so far into details as to present a definite idea of what a Church council should be. I may, therefore, state that it is meant that the discretion as to all matters which may legally be done or forborne in the church and parish, instead of being exercised, as it now is, by the incumbent alone, should be exercised by the Church Council, in which the incumbent and parishioners should be invited. It is proposed that no change shall be made in existing arrangements except by the consent of the majority of the council ; and on the other hand that anything which the majority demands shall be carried into effect ; but that these arrangements shall be subject to the consent or refusal of the bishop, who shall be able to act either personally or through his officer, the archdeacon or rural dean. These are the powers which such a body would exercise. They should be elected by the largest possible constituency, with the fewest possible exclusions ; and for the qualification of members of the council the fewest possible restrictions should be required. This wide and liberal system is proposed as necessary for the national character of the parochial community, and also as a safe and legitimate local counterpoise to the immense power of the central system established by law and unchangeable except by the general consent of the nation. It is proposed, further, that these councils should be established by a law, which might be at first permissive and tentative, but, if successful in its workings, would become obligatory. And, if the working of the councils were successful, it would be possible to increase the discretion now given to each parish, so that the system of the Church might be adapted to the needs of each parochial community. I have merely sketched what I understand by Church councils, that I may not appear to shrink from an explicit statement. But I hope the discussion will not turn on the details of the plan. The great question for Churchmen to decide is whether they desire that all discretion in the church and parish should be exercised by the clergyman alone, or whether that discretion should be shared by the representatives of the parishioners ; whether the

incumbent is to be an autocrat in all matters not decided by the general law, or whether he is to be a constitutional governor. What is the ideal of a Christian Church traced out for us in the New Testament? It is certainly not that of a mass of men governed arbitrarily by one individual, but of a body of which every part supplies something to the conduct of the life of the whole. St. Paul is never weary of enumerating the great variety of functions and functionaries—apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers, helps, governments, or of declaring that these are different persons with different gifts though harmonised by the same spirit. But what is the system in our parochial churches? The general law provides for the existence of a place of worship, for the appointment of a minister, and for certain specified services which he is to render. But beyond that law lies the whole work of the church and parish, and for this the whole discretion is lodged in the individual clergyman. The church fabric is the people's. But practically there is hardly any amount of change in it which the incumbent may not effect, from extreme neglect to the utmost elaboration of ornament, or from extreme Puritan simplicity to a condition in which it cannot be distinguished from a Roman Catholic church. The services are for the people; but whether they shall be at one time or another, frequent or few, simple or elaborate, said or sung, whether there shall be any hymns, and of what kind—all this is in the discretion of the incumbent alone. The general law provides for the collection of alms, and gives the churchwardens a concurrent discretion with the incumbent; but, practically, in almost all cases, collections are made at the discretion of the incumbent alone, and the people are not consulted. The general law provides that the sick should be visited; but the whole system of parish work lies beyond the law, and the discretion lies with the clergyman alone. The agents may be many or few, the work perfunctory or zealous; it is his work, and there is no one who can call him to account. He may have no curate or many; he may introduce scripture readers, mission women, deaconesses, sisterhoods, or he may leave the people quite uncared for. He may do nothing for the poor, or he may establish vast institutions for their benefit. He may collect and spend large sums in charity, and his charity may be of an enlightened kind which does good to the poor, or of that ignorant kind which tends to their utter demoralisation. And all this is reckoned as the work of the clergyman alone. Others may offer their aid, but what they must offer is to help *him* in a system of which *he* is the absolute master, not to do a work in which they have a recognised and independent position. They must offer to do a work which may be changed at the will and at the caprice of the clergyman, and which, on the appointment of a new incumbent, may be entirely swept away. Let such a state of things be judged of by the high spiritual standard of St. Paul's ideal. St. Paul makes the Church's work the work of the whole body; we make it the work of one man. St. Paul wishes all Christian powers to be exercised freely; we make their exercise dependent on the will of one man. The clergyman is everything, the people nothing. St. Paul places all efforts for the good of the community in the rank of gifts of the Sovereign Spirit, but gives a warning that those gifts may be evoked or repressed by human agency. I can hardly imagine a system less calculated to evoke those gifts, more likely to repress them, than that which I have described. The key note of this Congress was struck in a sermon which declared that all the Church's work was dependent on the Divine Spirit. I venture to say that in the arrangements which we are now considering, our Church is systematically quenching the Spirit. Let this state of things be judged by common and recognised principles of government, and it will be found equally faulty. There is a remarkable saying of Baxter, in his retrospect of his long ecclesiastical experience, to the effect that the real evil in the Church of Rome is not so much any particular tenet as its perverse and unnatural system of government. I believe the same may be said of the evils of which men complain in the parochial adminis-

tration of our Church. It is not so much that this or that wrong thing is done here or there, but that the system which commits the whole discretion to one man is perverse and unnatural. It would, I suppose, be imprudent and improper for a clergyman, speaking to an audience so largely made up of clergymen, to throw any doubt on the entire and unerring wisdom of parochial incumbents. But that is not the question. The question is whether any man, however wise, ought to have centered upon him the exercise of the whole of that judgment or discretion with which the community at large is endued. The question is whether it is not a great evil to the community that no power of thought, of judgment, of administration should be evoked except in one man. It is an old argument of the advocates of arbitrary government, and one which seems at first very plausible, that if you could ensure a perfectly good despot, despotism would be the best form of government. But, no, say the advocates of Constitutionalism: the healthy state of a community is not that in which the whole business is done for them by one good and wise man, but that in which the powers of each individual are called forth in thought and care and effort for the good of the whole. You may see at every turn the consequences of the false system now existing in our parishes. Do men complain of sacerdotalism? How is it likely that the sacerdotal instinct should be repressed when the clergy are made autocrats? Autocracy and sacerdotalism are twins. Do you complain of a growing clericalism which overlays the Church, and which breeds that worst of heresies that the clergy are the Church, a heresy to the prevalence of which every ecclesiastical discussion bears witness? Our system itself, by concentrating all power in the hands of the clergy, makes the clergy the Church. Do you complain that in all public affairs the clergy assume to act not as citizens, but as a class apart from the rest of the nation? What else can you expect when you maintain a system which, by its exclusiveness, cuts them off from the general interests? For us clergymen the system works equally ill. We are placed in a position of invidious isolation, which necessarily provokes mistrust. We have to act alone, instead of with the people, in matters which are their affairs as much as ours; men know little of our work; they are taken by surprise at things which we feel it right to do, and in many cases imbibe a growing alienation towards a Church system which they are impotent to check or influence. And then, when any great movement arises which affects the Church, it is regarded by the nation merely as a matter which affects the interests of the clergy. One party of the State may defend these interests just as they defend the interests of the publicans or of any other separate class; but the question raised in these Church controversies is commonly felt to be a question of the clergy against the nation; whereas, if the people generally were called to take part in the administration of Church affairs, it would be felt that he who attacks the Church attacks the nation itself. The root of almost all the evils of our Church system lies in the parochial autocracy of the clergy. But some will say, Well, it is right that some part should be given to the laity in parochial administration; but cannot this be done without law? No, it cannot; and for this reason. The incumbent's position is guaranteed by law. He is by law responsible for everything that is done in the church and parish, and you cannot divest him of any part of that responsibility except by giving to a Church council a position as legally secure and indefeasible as his. If men object to the method by which Church laws have been made ever since the Reformation, let them get some new method established; but till then we must use our present method. We must get Parliament to pass an Act for the establishment of Church councils in the parishes. Many of the clergy, I believe, are somewhat shaken in mind by the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874, and perhaps they have hardly recovered sufficiently to look with impartial eyes on the prospect of a new ecclesiastical law. But I think the Church councils would mitigate some of the features

of the Public Worship Act, the workings of which are disliked. Under that Act a parochial incumbent is left to act alone, and without consultation with his parishioners. He does not know their feelings. He goes on in a certain course till he reaches the borderland of legality, and then suddenly the storm bursts. And it is a veritable storm; for nothing can be done except by way of complaint on the part of parishioners aggrieved by their minister, a complaint which commonly issues in a lawsuit, which is looked upon as one of a criminal nature. It is rightly felt that this is not a very satisfactory way of settling minor matters relating to the worship of God. But with Church councils all this would be changed. The clergyman would have an opportunity of conferring with his parishioners before the questionable action was taken. They would be taken into confidence; the matter would be debated, accepted, rejected, or modified, as the case might be, and the resulting action being that of the parishioners as well as of the clergyman, there would be no provocation to the constant appeal to the courts. But, lastly, will not these councils, if established, be either so liable to impulse as to become revolutionary, or else so obstructive as to prevent all wholesome change? On this point I can speak with the authority of experience, having enjoyed the co-operation of an efficacious Church council for seven years. During that time the original compact has been strictly maintained. But I am not aware of anything having been proposed which could be thought revolutionary, nor am I conscious of having been permanently hindered in anything which I felt it right to propose for the benefit of the parish. We have during that time completely re-modelled the interior of the church, established a surpliced choir, adopted harvest festivals, a midnight service for the new year, the singing of an oratorio each winter at a grand musical service. We have established as many new institutions, I venture to think, as have arisen in any parish during a similar period, and we have set on foot a system of poor relief which has merited the approval of the best authorities on the subject in London, and has been copied in many other parishes. The most important of these changes have been made and carried with effect by the council itself; all of them have received its intelligent assent, and many have been very considerably modified by its debates. I can testify, further, that such a council, even in its rudimentary state, unrecognised by law, brings a clergyman into very useful contact with the minds of his parishioners, and makes him aware of currents of feeling of which he would otherwise have been ignorant. If my time still serves, and if it is not unduly egotistical, I will venture to relate an incident in illustration of this. Our church had been re-modelled, and the services were to be resumed in about two months' time, when a member of the council asked me what was to be the arrangement about the choir, which before had but a very precarious existence in the west-end organ-loft. I answered that I had no proposal to make, and I expected that my interlocutor, being a strong Protestant, would very possibly put in a caveat against a surpliced choir. To my surprise he told me that he wished to propose in the council that there should be a surpliced choir; and, still more to my surprise, when the debate took place in the council, there was actually found to be but one dissident; and, under arrangements made by the council, a choir was formed which has proved one of the least troublesome and one of the most effective institutions in the parish. My firm belief is that to the clergy no less than to the laity these councils would prove a boon. If the clergy surrender something in the way of actual power, they will gain more in the way of influence and confidence, and to a Christian minister confidence and influence are much more important than arbitrary power. I believe, further, that these councils will bring about better relations between the clergy generally and the nation at large, by accustoming the clergy to consider the feelings of the laity, and the laity to look upon the Church as their own. Imagine for a moment what would occur if it were enacted that on a

certain day elections for Church councils should take place in every parish in England. What a vast interest would be aroused! How earnestly would all Christian people strive to get good men elected! I do not think there would be many who would abstain from voting, and I do not think bad motives would be at work or bad men be returned. Religion would again take its place as a matter of public concern. The English nation would enter once more upon its ecclesiastical inheritance. I cannot but believe that by means of their councils the Church will assume a more healthy character, a grander and more truly national position; and that the laity, instead of feeling themselves dragged along perforce by a class which they stand in doubt of towards a goal which they do not see but which they dread, will follow with conviction a body of trusted leaders into the boundless and fruitful expense of practical Christian activity.

Mr. J. T. TOMLINSON, Salford.

THE one paramount reason for the adoption of parochial councils is the necessity for limiting the powers now possessed by incumbents.

I am not speaking of the parish priest, *as such*: nor of the moral influence of the individual clergyman; nor of that "ministering of the word and sacraments" peculiar to their office.

I speak only of the *legal* powers and *secular* authority of the holder of a benefice—his "freehold rights," his patronage, and the like—which are of "the things of Cæsar," as being the creations of human law.

No one pretends that there is any "divine right" of incumbents; yet they virtually monopolise the rights of the Church. "Church property," so called, is vested in their freeholds. Convocation, so far as it is elective, consists of *their* representatives. An incumbent may be a young man of twenty-five, or an old man of seventy; or a don, appointed by his college without reference to the wishes of the parishioners. However indolent or objectionable he may prove, he has for life the power to prevent any other views than his own from being heard in any pulpit in "his" parish, however extensive or populous that parish may be. He may change the ritual from slovenly nakedness to tawdry gorgeousness; the hymn-book from Bishop Colenso's to the "People's Hymnal;" the teaching from semi-deism to cis-montanism; he may exchange livings with an incumbent who will reverse these processes; he may stamp out every organisation for charitable, educational, or other purposes, connected with "his" church, or he may change them arbitrarily for unaccustomed ones; and the people for whose benefit both parish and incumbent have been created have, by law, no more power to mitigate what is called his "discretion" than the sheep on the common.

There is practically no limit to this "*one-man system*" in the Church of England. Since the abolition of the High Commission Court, the bishops have lost the power of enforcing their injunctions; and the incumbent, like a feudal baron of the middle ages, is as independent of his titular sovereign as of his vassals. The control of the purse-strings passed away from the parish vestry with the abolition of church-rates. Neither bishop, vestry, nor churchwardens have the slightest control over any moneys collected by the incumbent in "his own church," except at what is called "the offertory."

Centralisation is now almost complete. Hardly a single office can be held by a layman in any parish except as the nominee of the incumbent, and on sufferance during his good pleasure. Even the churchwardens are no exception to this state-

ment, since the man chosen by the parishioners cannot act without the concurrence of a colleague chosen for that very purpose by the incumbent. It is just as though the Crown were to nominate one out of every two burgesses sent (from Sheffield, for instance) to the House of Commons. Nay, it is even more absurd than that, for it is the special duty of the churchwardens to "present" the incumbent for any breach of the ecclesiastical law, and to sue him for any misappropriation of the church furniture or other property of the parish. In the diocese of Manchester, for instance, an incumbent pawned the communion plate, and the parishioners had actually to apply to the incumbent's own nominee to sue for its restoration!

I do not enter into the history of the successive encroachments by which this state of things has been brought about, which you may see in Toulmin Smith's work on "The Parish." It is enough that the present position of an English incumbent is unique, and has no parallel in any country in Europe.

Now, of what possible use could be a "voluntary council" as a means of tempering the despotism of which I am complaining? Let us imagine a parallel case. Suppose that the master of a workhouse, or the house-surgeon of a hospital, had a "freehold right" in the public lands and buildings, and had a fixed stipend secured to him in perpetuity, irrespective of the results of his management. Would he not imperceptibly gather round him a sympathetic following—personal, partisan, or (to borrow a word which includes both) "congregational"—and would he not soon come to resent any suggestions from the general public as being an "impertinent interference" with "his" affairs? Would he not naturally wish people to furnish money and assistance to carry out his plans without the "fuss and bother," as he would term it, of discussion or consultation?

That, I suspect, is what an incumbent means when he talks of "lay co-operation." If it were wished merely to divert attention from his own monopoly of power, he might set up a "voluntary council," to consist of persons who should meet when he summoned them, but without any legal rights or ascertained position, to state their views without having any definite responsibility, and be liable, both individually and collectively, to dismissal by him at any time, and to the overruling of their resolutions at his pleasure. Such a "voluntary" council has no element of reality; educated men will not care to play at council—"making believe very much," as the children say.

If we seriously wish to engage the heart and mind, the wealth and influence of the *whole* Church, we shall take care that our "parochial council" (if we are to have one) shall be composed of communicants, freely elected by the widest possible constituency of those who "profess and call themselves" Churchmen. And we shall insist that its powers and duties be defined and guarded by law. Then with the sense of power will come the sense of responsibility; and men will no longer hesitate to tender advice which they will have a recognised right to urge.

As to the powers with which the council should be invested, they may be summed up briefly under two heads.

1st. Let all collection and disbursement of money be transferred absolutely to the council, whose accounts should be audited regularly with the utmost publicity. The incumbent would then cease to "serve tables," and his pastoral visits would lose nothing of their spiritual efficacy if he no longer acted as relieving-officer to the poor, and as mendicant friar to the rich. There is nothing "spiritual" about £. s. d.—"let them be handed over," therefore, "to the secular arm."

2nd. Wherever a choice of alternatives as to ritual, music, school management, or any other matter affecting the parish, has been left by law to the "discretion" of somebody, let it be necessary for the incumbent to gain the consent of the parish council before acting upon his own individual discretion.

Even where his judgment is riper than theirs, it is better that he should have to

wait until he has gained their confidence and convinced their judgment before he makes alterations which, however desirable in the abstract, may be ill suited to the condition of taste, education, or temper existing in the parish. And if he would feel it a hardship to forego what he conscientiously prefers, let him remember that the hardship would be no less keenly felt by those whose wishes he purposes to disregard, and that their ignorance (if it be so) is the reflex of the teaching which they have hitherto received.

In the few minutes that are left to me, I will anticipate some objections likely to be raised in the discussion which is to follow. It will be asked, for instance, "What is a layman?" He is a person, not in holy orders, who has been admitted into the fellowship of Christ's Church by baptism. The very fact that he is capable of being excommunicated proves his membership.

Again; "What is a parishioner?" In one of the most recent Acts of Parliament we have a definition which is more stringent than the franchise adopted by our own Church in Ireland and the older colonies, viz., an adult male, resident in the parish for twelve months, who has signed a solemn declaration that he is a member of the Church. If that qualification suffices for matters affecting the whole national Church, it may serve well enough for the affairs of a parish.

To those who will urge a communicant franchise, I would suggest the difficulty of defining "What is a communicant?" The old "Test and Corporations Act" proved that unworthy persons will receive the holy sacrament to obtain a vote. In some parishes it would disqualify earnest men who are repelled by the slovenly negligence, or the illegal rites, with which the incumbent chooses to celebrate; for parishioners fear, not unreasonably, to be "partakers of other men's sins," by assisting at a celebration which they regard as profane or as idolatrous. Moreover, in parishes where habitual confession is encouraged as a fit preparation for right reception, a majority of the communicants would be persons habitually under the "direction" of the incumbent. Thus the "keys of the kingdom of heaven" may be used to open the ballot-box. I say nothing of the unfair use which the incumbent might be tempted to make of his power of "repelling any" whose views he disliked; nor of the danger that men would come to "abhor the offering of the Lord," if they saw the sacrament of love made the *tessera* of a party. It is sufficient to urge that every consideration which would dissuade us from excommunicating the whole mass of the laity who do not now "communicate at the least three times in the year," is, if you examine it, equally a reason for letting their wants and wishes find legitimate expression. For, to use the words of Dr. Arnold, "discipline never can, and indeed never ought to, be restored till the Church resumes her lawful authority, and puts an end to the usurpation of its powers by the clergy."*

In the established Church there is, unhappily, as yet, no adequate recognition of that democratic element which, in the Acts of the Apostles, and in the Epistle to the Corinthians, is called "the Church"† —a recognition which imparts to Presbyterianism and Congregationalism a force quite disproportionate to the wealth and number of their adherents. We may be told that the existence of lay patronage secures the rights of the laity. How so? Though the patron be not a clergyman, he may, nevertheless, be a Jew, an Atheist, a Plymouth Brother, or what not. How then does he "represent" the faithful? The patron represents, not the *rights* of the laity, but their wrong, viz., that the "cure" of their souls may be sold by a man who never gave a penny to the Church, merely because his reputed ancestor centuries ago invested in an endowment which has served ever since to enrich his

* Preface to *Sermons on the Christian Life*.

† Acts xv. 4, 22, 23; 1 Cor. i. 2; cf. Eph. iv. 16; 1 Tim. iii. 15.

family, under pretence of *giving* money "to God and his Church." It is to the everlasting honour of Scotchmen that they obliterated this scandal.

We shall hear that the royal supremacy expresses the voice of the laity. But the "royal supremacy" merely means the supremacy of the law as enforced by the civil executive, over priests and laics alike. The "supremacy of the Crown" is at least as great in civil as in ecclesiastical matters; yet no one pretends that municipal or parliamentary franchises ought to have been withheld.

So again, Parliament, which consists of Jews, Quakers, Papists, and others, cannot represent the faithful laity, *as such*. It contains many *ex-officio* clerical members; the clergy play an important part in county and borough elections; and ecclesiastical questions are dealt with by Parliament most reluctantly. There can be no pretext for saying that a Parliament selected for totally different purposes affords an adequate representation of the laity.

Right reverend and reverend fathers of the clergy, what we ask is simply this—"Let nothing be done in the Church without the"—Church!

REV. W. HAY CHAPMAN, Christ Church, Clifton, Bristol.

ABOUT eight years ago the subject of Parochial Church Councils was very prominently brought forward. It was about that time that Lord Sandon introduced into the House of Commons the Parochial Councils Bill, and at the Church Congress in 1871 there was a very full discussion on the subject. It was about that time that several of our bishops recommended their clergy to consider the advisability of introducing voluntary Church parochial councils. The theory of Church councils, I consider, has been pretty well exhausted; there has been enough talk about the way in which they should be formed, and about the desirability of forming them. I therefore gather that the subject has been introduced to-day, rather for the purpose of gathering information as to the way in which Church councils have been carried on during the last few years. I shall, therefore, confine my remarks to the practical side of the question, and give you my reasons why I think it is desirable to have a Church council. There are, of course, some parishes where the necessary materials for the formation of a council do not exist. There are other parishes where the clergy and the parishioners are so well satisfied with the existing state of things—be they satisfactory or the very reverse—that they say, "We need no such body; we want no change: all we ask is to be let alone." I wish, however, to deal with the case of a clergyman who feels deeply the responsibility of the charge committed to him, and who is determined—God helping him—to do all he can to promote God's work in his parish.

First.—It is desirable to have a parochial council, because it brings the clergyman into close relationship with his parishioners. There was a time when the charge was brought against the clergy of their unwillingness to give the laity their proper place in Church work. No such charge can now be brought. Lay representatives are introduced into our diocesan conferences, and into the rural-decanal meetings. But I venture to say that the questions discussed at these meetings are not the ones which the laity feel the most interested in. What they think most about, and what they care most for, is the Church in their own parish. They want to be brought into close relationship with their own clergy, as regards their own Church matters. Being fully persuaded of this fact, I have endeavoured during the last few years to act upon it. A few years ago, when I was called upon to undertake the charge of a difficult parish, with a population of 5,000, I was informed

that no layman took any interest in Church matters, and that it was difficult to find any suitable gentleman to act as churchwarden. I, therefore, determined to form a council. After a great deal of anxious thought and consultation, a council of sixteen members was formed, and I was at once brought into immediate contact with my leading laymen, and instead of being at the mercy of chance impressions gathered from a few, or of receiving the advice of those who might be ready to give the advice which they might think would be well received, I had an influential body of gentlemen who were ready, not only to consider parochial matters, but were prepared to carry out their views. The result has been, that the church finance has been placed on a sound basis. The church has not only been made thoroughly comfortable for worship, but it has been wonderfully improved in appearance, and I am persuaded that, without the council, neither of these important objects could ever have been accomplished.

Secondly.—It is desirable to have a parochial council, because by means of a council the best and the most suitable arrangements can be made for the conduct of public worship. How desirable it is that, before any changes are made, the clergyman should consult his parishioners, so that if alterations are determined on, (alterations which some are sure to call innovations,) they should be the act of the council, and not the fancy of the clergyman.

Thirdly.—It is desirable to have a parochial council, because the clergyman is enabled to do a great deal more direct spiritual work in the parish. With regard to the mode of electing the council, the members must not be chosen from one class of parishioners, or from men holding particular opinions. The council ought to fairly represent all classes and views. Thus we have introduced the offertory. The choir arrangements have been greatly improved, and several other matters connected with our Church worship have been changed. I am persuaded that had these changes been made without a council, they would have caused a great deal of trouble in the parish. Before forming our council, we had a large meeting of parishioners, to consider whether a council should be formed, and, if so, how? After a great deal of interesting discussion, it was determined that the election should be made by the vestry, and that the council should be elected annually at Easter. It is most important that the parishioners should determine the mode of election. In my own parish, since the council was formed, additional services have been carried on, and the stipend for a second curate has been provided. Let me add a word of caution. The chairman of a council must be prepared to exercise great patience. The members are men who meet together frequently on other occasions, and who are apt to take different views of matters at all times. Hence they are pretty sure to differ on subjects such as those brought before the Church council. The chairman must be prepared to exercise great patience, and quietly allow the members to express their views. It requires great tact on the part of the chairman to preside over such a body. The chairman, and those who wish for the success of such a movement, must not feel discouraged if some of the members should fall off in their attendance. Some men will take a great interest in the council so long as every thing goes their own way; but when conclusions are arrived at with which they do not agree they will quickly withdraw.

The meetings of a parochial council must ever be a great comfort to the clergyman, as it affords the opportunity of united prayer for God's blessing on all parochial matters. This is the real secret of strength—this gives reality to all Church work.

DISCUSSION.

REV. W. BARKER.

I AM a very humble individual: I come from West Cowes; my name is Barker. There have been, Mr. Chairman, so many hares started to-day—I think we are now in the game season—that it is very difficult to follow every one of them, especially as so many of them go to earth directly you see their tails. It seems to me that Mr. Earnshaw is supposing a state of things which does not exist. You know we, as practical men, must look at things as they are, not as St. Paul would have them. Our Church happens to exist in this country by law; it is established by law—I suppose it will be admitted that it is “an established Church.” Now you must look at that fact, whether you like it or not. That being so, it seems to me that if you passed an Act of Parliament appointing a council in every parish, you then put it in the power of every parish to have precisely what ritual they like. There is a law for the Church, and the incumbent is amenable to that law; and surely it is far better to have somebody to hang if anything is done wrongly. Why, you know that a committee has no bowels at all; and when you say to me that you are going to have a Church council, and that the object of the Church councils is to produce peace in your congregation, I believe the result would be the very reverse. We have been told by the last speaker, who doubtless possesses that inestimable gift of tact, that it is very difficult indeed to keep the council in harmonious action, and that when you have succeeded to some extent in getting the council to work harmoniously, the congregation kicks against the decision of the majority.

REV. W. HAY CHAPMAN.

NOT the congregation; the members of the council kick.

REV. W. BARKER.

WELL, the members of the council; I assume they are members of the congregation. The Church is legally constituted, and ordained in a certain distinct way. When a man is appointed over the congregation, then the congregation can pull that man up for any dereliction of his duty. The bishop exists for the purpose of hearing the complaints of the parishioners; and if the incumbent does anything against the law, the law can come down upon him. Let me express, also, my objections to a council. First, there is the great difficulty of the election. There is more difficulty in that process than has been supposed in the observations which have been addressed to you; for you know very well that when we elect persons to some of the offices of the Church at present, the majority of the parishioners take no interest in the world in the election. At our own parish we have a parish numbering 7,000. I gave out in church, in the loudest possible voice, that we were going to do something extremely important, that we were going to elect two men to the diocesan conference. I declare there was not a single person in the vestry. Suppose, in the second place, you get a council. The whole object, if I may say so, of your council is to clip the wings of Ritualists. I am not a Ritualist: far from it; but if the council is not to clip the Ritualists' wings, and is not to interfere with the service, what is it to do? Was it to determine what hymn-book they were to have? I know very well that in one's own parish, one wanted to change the old edition of the “Ancient and Modern” to the new edition, and that the simple announcement that we were going to make a change on a certain Sunday pleased everybody, and that everybody purchased the new hymn-book for a penny. If you wish to create

voluntarily those organisations, and popularly elect a body for the purpose of saying when a hymn-book shall be changed, or to deal with the finances of the parish, no man in his senses would object. But we are all clergymen, and we know what the finance question is. Good gracious! I should like a good deal more finance, but our difficulty is to get money to finance with. Why, a banker would do all your finance for nothing, if you would only bank with him. In our own parish we have a school, and all the children of the town are under our own instruction, and the accounts are kept by myself and the churchwardens, and passed by the Government; and when you tell me you are going to get a vast organisation in the parish for the sake of changing a hymn-book, or for the sake of making up the finance of your parish, it seems to me you are getting a great Nasmyth to break a nut. Unless you give a council something to do, you will never get a sensible man to join a council. It is all nonsense! If you tell me this, that you are going to disestablish the Church—I will not say I am going to agree with you or not—then it is very important you should have some properly constituted body for the clergyman to consult. But as long as the Church is not disestablished, and one man is responsible to the bishop, and also to the law, it is far better to have that one person responsible than to shift the responsibility upon the shoulders of an irresponsible council. The speaker who spoke last spoke of three parishes: the first was where a council could not be constituted, because composed mostly of ignorant farmers; the second place was where nobody wanted any change; and the third place was where a council was wanted. Now where would it be wanted? Now, my opinion is that a parish which is supposed to need a council would suffer more from its existence than without one. Instead of harmony being established, discord would reign in council and parish. You see, my friends, by the observations that I have made, that I am opposed to the establishment of parochial councils by law. I will conclude with this remark: that where a good man is appointed to a parish he does not want a council; and that where a bad man is appointed, and a council is elected, he is led by the nose by that council; and that is how the matter stands, in my opinion. Of course, the great thing is to get good men appointed, and give your council a veto power. But no one would give a council that power under present circumstances. On the whole, the Church works very well under the clergy as it is. There has been vast Church extension; there have been large sums of money raised for all kinds of purposes; and it is only in a very few parishes that there is any unharmony. In towns the parochial system is broken up entirely, and people have the opportunity of attending any church which suits their tastes best. There is a gentleman here whom I know very well. He has held particular doctrines very strongly, and I should like to know whether all the parishioners go to his church. One of the clergymen of London—I am sorry not to see him here—who has done as much good as any man in London in his generation, was narrating a circumstance which shows how the man would have been hampered, upon the right hand or the left, if he had been controlled by a council. He was a good man, full of the Holy Ghost; he knew what was good for his people; he was a man of deep, earnest piety and zeal; and I say, Leave that man alone, and he will do good for his people and for the Church of God; he does not want to be hampered by a number of persons who, most of them, perhaps, are ignorant of the needs of a parish, and who are wholly or in part out of sympathy with his work.

REV. J. LLEWELYN DAVIES, Rector of Christ's Church,
Marylebone, London.

THE case for parish Church councils, brought before us by previous speakers, would have been incomplete without some such illustration as the last speaker has afforded us, of the clerical spirit which Church councils are intended to balance and check. Mr. Barker says that all will go well so long as the clergyman has everything in his own hands. That is a natural opinion for the clergy to hold, though there are many clergymen who look at the question more broadly, and have come to a different conclusion. But we want to know what the feeling of the laity is on this question. And therefore I welcome heartily the able and exhaustive paper read by Mr. Stephenson, and the remarks made by the layman who has followed him. The fact is, you could scarcely expect a council of laymen in parishes to be called for by the clergy, who would suppose—with good reason—that it was the object of the council to deprive the clergyman of some of the power which he now possesses and exercises. But we are told, and we have considerable evidence of it, that great wants are felt by the laity to exist in our present system. They are conscious of a discontent which they do not always express. They feel a kind of humiliation of which they do not like to complain. They feel, moreover, that their gifts and faculties are not called out in the service of God and the Church as they might be. If there is any truth in this view, the arguments which may be urged against parochial councils will not be of sufficient weight to turn the scale against them. I seem to myself to be familiar with the objections to which such councils are liable. The most serious of them appears to be that a council would give some occasion for faction and division in a parish. I freely admit that in some parishes by instituting a council we should throw down the golden apple of public worship amongst contending parties. That would be a real disadvantage. But does not a similar objection apply to all representative institutions? Why, I know some able and earnest men, whose minds have dwelt so exclusively on the evils which undoubtedly beset representative institutions in general, that they are prepared to give up government by representation entirely. And if there is nothing to be set against this particular objection, if there are no manifest advantages to be secured by parochial councils which out-weigh the risk of such an evil, then I admit they ought not to be instituted. But we contend that they would do good, compared with which the possible evil that might result from them would be inconsiderable.

As to the powers which a council ought to possess, I think it is very difficult to define them with precision. A voluntary council is a different thing in-kind from a legal council; and various matters may be assigned by consent to the former which could not well be committed by an Act of Parliament to the charge of the latter. I should be content at first that very limited powers, capable of strict legal definition, should be given to Church councils, believing that legal power given to parishes with regard to matters of worship would be like a spark of life put into an organism which might afterwards grow into the exercise of such other functions as experience might show to be desirable. I have often heard it said that in spiritual matters the hard hand of the law ought not to be introduced; that there is something so chilling, so mechanical, in legal obligation that in spiritual things you ought to look to voluntary agency only. Very well! But there is legal power, already, on the one side. The clergyman possesses what we think too much of legal power under the present system. You cannot get rid of law, when it comes to ultimate enforcement. If anything is to be settled by mutual agreement, each party may appeal to the law against the violation of its rights by the other. We

should desire that the clergyman and the people should act in true spiritual harmony. But the question is, which of the two is to be backed by the law in settling things in which both have an interest? We desire that the power should be shared with the people more than it is now. And I have no fear that spiritual life would be thereby chilled. My own conviction is that there would be a real vitality in the power proposed to be given to the people in parishes; and I should be prepared to struggle against the confessed difficulties which beset the establishment of such institutions as parochial councils, in the belief that they would be in the long run of essential value to the Church of England.

Mr. T. COLLINS, Knaresbrough.

THE clergy are too much in the habit of talking about "my church," "my parish," my this, and my that. We all know that in this fortunate country the parson is made for the parish, and not the parish for the parson. If the clergyman obeys the law, he is bound to have services twice every day of the week; he is bound to baptise and to marry; and even if persons cannot come to the communion with a quiet conscience, he is bound to receive their confessions. This is the obligation for the clergyman; but there is none on the part of the laity to attend any of his services. It is the great advantage of this country that you should have a clergyman of the parish who should be bound to give ministrations of religion when required by any inhabitant of the parish. However, I think we all should agree that parochial councils, when properly constituted, would be a wise institution, and a moral check upon the clergy. But then we come to this great difficulty—Ought these councils to be voluntary, or ought they to be the creatures of law? Now, I believe where you have an established Church—as you have in this country, and I hope you will long have one—I think it very unadvisable that you should have councils established by law with legal powers; and the speakers on this occasion who have favoured legal councils have very cunningly intimated that these are matters of detail with which they forbear to deal. But all practical questions are questions of detail; and it is when you get into these that legal councils break down; and that is the reason why, when Lord Sandon's Bill was brought forward many years ago, many, and amongst them I myself, voted for the second reading of the bill. When you come to the working of the machinery of Lord Sandon's Bill, you see the whole thing is impossible. I voted against the disestablishment of the Irish Church, but when you said, with regard to Lord Sandon's Bill, "What will you do with the parochial council in the city of Cork, where four-fifths of the people are Roman Catholics? Are you going to hand over to the Roman Catholic population of Cork the power to prescribe, within certain limits, the ritual to be adopted in the established Church in Ireland?" You know it won't bear argument. How could you, in the cities of Dublin or Cork, hand over to the majority of the ratepayers the power of electing a council to alter the mode of services—to say the services shall be at nine, or ten, or eleven, or twelve o'clock? If we are to have a council—as most of the speakers say you ought to have—elected by every ratepayer in the country, why, probably, the Nonconformists in this country are a third of the whole population. In some districts they are in the majority; in Wales they are in a majority. Well, you cannot have one law for Wales, another for Sheffield, another for Cowes. You must have a uniform code of law throughout. Are you going to let Jew, Turk, heretic, and infidel elect your councils? Of course, if you adopt the theory of Mr. Hughes and certain others, very honest people, in

the Church of England, who think that the parish ought to frame the religion to be taught in the parish church, of course then it would be very well to have a council elected by every ratepayer. But the Church of England, besides being the established Church, is a Christian denomination, with its own dogmas, and its own notions of what Christianity is; and these are not to be subject to the fluctuating wishes of every ratepayer of every parish in England: you would introduce a bastard Congregationalism of the worst possible kind, if the spirit of this was carried out. The whole tone of the remarks of the speakers, though they have not ventured to say this, is that the worship in the parish church ought to be in accordance with the wish of the majority of the parishioners. But that is not the reason why we Churchmen built and endowed out of our own pockets new bishoprics, and churches and schools. Why, we have covered England with voluntary schools, with probably five or six millions out of our pockets during the last few years. We have done this to support the Church of England in its own dogmas and creeds. We do not want what Canon Ryle calls a pulpy religion, a jelly-fish without any backbone in it, so that it may suit Mr. Hughes and a few speculative philosophers like Mr. Hughes. We speak to the old Catholic Church of England, which embraces within certain limits a large phase of Christian thought, but at the same time is not so wide as to admit any person who chooses to call himself a Christian. Well, it is on this ground that I believe the establishment of legal councils in a country where you have an established Church is most mischievous. It would be a matter of ill-advised expediency to divide every parish into those who belong to the Church of England and those who do not. In fact, you cannot do it, because I recollect hearing Mr. Schnadhorst, of Birmingham, a minister, I believe, of the Birmingham League, say, "I am, though I never go to Church, I am a non-conforming member of the Church of England, and I am a *bonâ fide* member of the Church;" and so he was by law. Well, then, if you would have a council elected by all the parishioners, it is not a wise thing to have them elected by people solely who are what you call *bonâ fide* Churchmen. By councils established voluntarily, of course you exercise the moral check which the clergy ought to have exercised over them—you say that they ought not to have this, and ought not to have that. As to the hymn-books, most books contain a certain number of hymns of the same character throughout. I may say that I used to have an opportunity of going to early communion once a month, in my parish church; but with a new vicar all was changed. Of course I have to bow to this, and I do not know that a parochial council would give me any help on that matter; but, at the same time, I feel very strongly that the clergy ought not to be able to carry out their own whims and caprices, irrespective of the wishes of the Churchmen of their parish.

REV. J. B. PEARSON, LL.D., Newark.

WE have had much this morning about imperialism and autocracy. I never before fully understood the meaning and force of those oft-cited words,—“Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown.” I rise to add, if I may so call it, a buttress to Mr. Stephenson’s building from the clerical side. I think that any incumbent who has had experience of a large parish must have found out the great difficulty of pleasing everybody; and although it is not the business of a clergyman merely to please, yet we must all admit that there are a large number of details in which, if we do not satisfy our congregations, we utterly fail of our office. Now I think it has

been too much assumed that the clergy are a self-willed and a self-pleasing body, who enjoy this imperialism and this autocracy. I do not think that is a fair account; on the contrary many of us would find it an immense relief to have an authoritative representation of our parishes, upon which we could lay the burden of any changes. In getting rid of some of our autocracy, we should get rid of a great deal of unpleasant responsibility about detail. To take one particular point that was mentioned by a previous speaker—changing the hours of service—it so happens that I have tried that. It was not at my own suggestion that the hours of service were changed; but some members of the congregation very much preferred to have service at eleven than half-past ten. After a little talking we made it eleven. Then someone else put in his word, who missed his walk between service and dinner, and very much preferred half-past ten. This kind of incident is very familiar to you all. Would it not be a very great advantage to have an authoritative body upon which to lay the burden of such things? For myself, I should be heartily thankful for it; but you will see at once that a council must have a legal power to be in any sense an effective instrument in a parish. A clergyman has, under the present state of things, no right to devolve the power of judgment that he has, and the power to exercise that judgment in practical matters, upon any council whatever. Supposing that one had a voluntary Church council, and that they recommended some details which were not acceptable to the incumbent, it is rather a nice point of conscience whether the incumbent, thinking in an opposite direction to the majority of the council, would be justified in acting upon their recommendations. To be worth anything, the council ought to be legally constituted. The last speaker has assumed that the whole constitution of the Church of England is to be taken up by the roots, and that it is to be left to the vestry of each particular parish to determine what church that parish shall have. I think that we must assume that the Church of England would still exist, and that clergymen would still be amenable to just the same laws as at present. It is only on points of detail that the council would be appealed to. In forming your judgment, I must therefore ask you to dismiss from your minds a very large portion of that eloquent speech to which you have just listened. We are not in any such danger as those remarks imply. Why should not we retain our legal establishment and our present liability to law, and yet, at the same time, leave certain points to be settled by those who are trusted by our parishioners? That is what I understand by the action of a parochial Church council. We have a similar instance of the joint working of central and local authorities in the Education Acts and the bye-laws of special districts. As I have been thinking this matter over, and listening to the various speeches, one difficulty did strike me, and that is, with regard to the relation between the teaching of a church and the services of a church. It would probably be wise if the control of the council were limited to those services by law required. I do not think a clergyman should have to go to his council to ask how often holy communion is to be administered, for instance. That is a point on which the pastor of the parish is the proper judge; but with regard to the mode of ritual followed at the ordinary Sunday hours, I think, in many points, that that may very safely and profitably be left to our congregations. As to the matter of finance, of course the Church council, along with the control of the finance, would assume the responsibility. I hope that in many parishes they would, doubtless, assume the responsibility of the schools: that would be a very happy condition of things. Mr. Earnshaw's ideal of a Christian Church seemed to me to be destructive of the very idea of a national Church. His method would establish independent plans of working and worshipping. I think that those of us who go from church to church, know already that there is an abundance of variety. One requires a regular coaching in the vestry if one goes into a strange church, and I should be very sorry to see the

Church go further in the direction of liberty of ritual. I think that if Mr. Earnshaw's scheme were carried out, we should run the risk of finding ourselves occasionally, in a strange place of worship, expected to join in a use as utterly unlike that which we have been accustomed to associate with the Church of England as the worship of different denominations is now. I do hope that, with or without Church councils, at all events the Church of England will grow not less and less but more and more compact as a body, working for the good of the English nation.

MR. ABRAM BROOKSBANK, Sheffield.

I WOULD just like to follow by a few observations what Mr. Collins has said about what was going on in Ireland. He spoke of the differences there would be with Church councils if they were partially elected by Roman Catholics. I wish the meeting to understand that the Irish Church is not the established Church of Ireland, and that in speaking of the national Church of England, there is no more similarity than there would be in referring to the election of Presbyters in Scotland. In my judgment permissive Church councils are of little or no value. As a rule they are called by the clergyman when he thinks proper, and then simply to endorse his own individual opinions. If Church councils are to be of any use whatever, it seems to me they must be made legal—not to over-ride everything which the clergyman may do, but to see that he is properly within the limits of the law. It must be perfectly obvious to anyone who will consider the question that if a meeting is called, the clergyman presides, and votes are taken upon the subject, and that then the clergyman has the final decision and upsets the whole thing. The brains of the laity are not likely again to be present at such councils. The gentleman who came from Cowes—Mr. Barker, I think—is a remarkable instance of what I hope is passing away: clergymen who talk of “my church,” and “my schools,” and “my” this, and “my” the other, as though the laity were no part of the Church of England at all. I believe the Church of England to be the national Church, and if that national Church is to remain the Church of England, you must in every possible way widen the basis of the parochial system, and give to the laity that direct control in the church by the parish to which, to all intents and purposes, they are entitled. I was very much struck yesterday in a discussion upon the just comprehensiveness of the Church. From the speeches of three parties, each of them seemed to say, We are right, and the others are wrong; and, What is the means by which one particular section is to be turned out of the Church of England? There is a great division of thought, and much animosity existing among those three sections. Well, since it is disapproved by this meeting I will not go on with this point, but my opinion remains the same, make it as mild as ever you please. I was going to say that parochial councils, and direct contact with the laity, will soften, to a great extent, the acerbity of the clergy. It seems to me, further than this, that the tendency of all government, in the present day, is to be more and more under popular control. The Church of England is quite an exception to this, in every respect. It has, strictly speaking, no popular control. I think that is a great mistake; and depend upon this, that if the Church of England is to continue the national Church, you must do everything you can to get rid of what I call the autocracy of the clergy, and of those laws which generally govern the Church, which are simply the relics of a by-gone age.

Rev. JOHN W. BARDSLEY, St. Saviour's, Liverpool.

I HAVE had a voluntary council for five years. Mr. Collins has addressed us in a very humorous speech on this subject. I thought at first that he came to bless, then I thought he was going to curse altogether; but at the present moment I cannot tell whether he meant to bless or curse. He spoke in favour of a voluntary council, but when he pictured the questions to be discussed there, I, who have had such a council, felt my hair rise on end, for I believe that to establish such a council, in which the doctrines of the Church of England might be discussed and settled either the one way or the other, would be the most disastrous thing that could befall the Church of England. But that is not the council which has been represented by Mr. Fremantle. I would ask permission to read what was the principle upon which our own was established:—"In addition to the objects obtained by the legal functions of the incumbent and churchwardens, it is desirable to constitute a consultative body to advise and assist in the Church charities, collections, subscriptions, and in the management of the disposable funds of the Church," if there be any, "and generally as to any matters concerning Church services and work which are subject to the discretion of the minister or churchwardens." That was our principle, and I believe it would be a very great advantage if those Church councils were multiplied. I am not prepared to say we are ready yet to have such councils enforced by law, but I do hold that it is very important that, in many parishes up and down the country the question is being tested. The whole question is not ready for the crystallisation of law, but sooner or later, we do believe, it will come to this. In my own parish, I contend that I can feel the pulse of my people in a way which I never could before. Before I had a Church council, I was afraid to have a collection; I thought the people would fancy I was bleeding them too freely. I assure you, as a matter of fact, that my people are now ready for collections every other Sunday, and if I adopted the weekly offertory, it would be by the constraint put upon me by the members of my council. When the humorous speaker from West Cowes informed us that "after announcing in his very loudest voice that there was to be a meeting to elect delegates, nobody went to it," that was surely an evidence that his parish is so admirably settled that everybody has perfect confidence in the vicar. Nevertheless, what I must say is this, that the election of a Church council quickens your vestry meeting. I have known what it is to beg people to attend on Easter-Monday, in order to elect each other for the offices of vestrymen and sidesmen. Let the vicar of any parish tell the people that he is going to associate them with himself in a council: he will have someone else with him. In some parishes a great amount of local wisdom is lost. There are men who think they have the qualifications for the office of churchwardens, and the post is coveted. In my own parish there are admirable men in the office, and no one wishes to turn them out. We have, however, men in the council who are now in training for the office of churchwarden, and I cannot but feel that if my present churchwardens were removed, there are fifteen or twenty men who could furnish me with successors, whose training would ensure admirable service. As regards changes in our service, I find it is of great importance to have the aid of the council. I freely admit that no Church council can authorise practices which are contrary to the law. But the question is whether, within the limits of the law, there are not different ways of conducting our services, as to the amount of music and things of that kind, which are perfectly open for a clergyman to settle, with the advice of his people; I believe they would be always much better settled if he talked them over with his council first. In one matter I may say that I learnt to see that my council were right and

I was wrong. This morning it has been argued that if you have a council of farmers they are men of prejudice. May not the clergyman have his prejudice? Is it ten to one, in such a council, that the clergyman has no prejudices? The odds are too many, when I look around me upon my clerical brethren. If disestablishment come, it will be a great advantage for us to have tried this experiment. I do not believe that disestablishment will come. I believe that the Church councils will help greatly to prevent it, because, by associating yourselves with the laity of the country in this way, you strengthen them in their attachment to the Church. David Hume said that the Church of England would always tend to decay, because it always crushed enthusiasm; but I do believe now that there is an enthusiasm springing up in the Church of England, of which we saw something last night in reference to the temperance question. The fact is, there are some men who, whether they have a council or no council, cannot get on with their people. You cannot get a panacea for every parish. I went up last night to a sturdy Yorkshireman, having lost my way, and asked him to direct me to the place where I was staying. As we went along, I found him ready to dispute every point raised at our Congresses. We came to a building which I knew to be the Fever Hospital; but hoping to find some subject on which we could agree, I said, "Is that the Fever Hospital, sir?" He replied, "They say it is, but I don't know it for a fact." Whether such a man were in the chair of a Church council or a simple member, he would be an awkward customer. But we are not contemplating men of that kind; we are thinking of the nation and the Church at large; and my experience is most strongly in favour of the establishment of these voluntary Church councils, and I believe we shall ultimately have them by law established.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE, M.P.

I HAVE not had the privilege of hearing the papers and set speeches this morning, but I trust you will allow me the privilege of repeating convictions which I had reached after much thought and care when I was busying myself during two successive sessions of Parliament over this question as embodied in Lord Sandon's Act. But I will first refer to the gentleman who spoke last but one. Memory is a very fallible thing, but I dare put my memory against his, and I assert in this room that if there was one thing in which Mr. Wood, Mr. Davies, and Mr. Ryle agreed, it was the energetic and passionate determination to keep all parties united within the pale of the Church of England. The question of Church councils may be viewed in two ways. Do you want the council to spy the parson, or to help the parson? If you want a council to spy the parson, I will have nothing to do with it. If you want one to help him, let me give you my notions. This room yesterday afternoon rang with cheers, as timely as they were enthusiastic, to the principle of variety among the clergy of the Church of England. Be very cautious that you do nothing that can mar or curtail that variety. What must inevitably mar and curtail variety would be the effecting, by an Act of Parliament, what would be a revolution in the relations of clergy and layfolk all round: by the creation, in every parish—alike in the town parish of 30,000 inhabitants and in the rural parish of 150 inhabitants—of a Parliamentary Church council, all of them cut upon the same pattern, all drawn upon the same lines, following as the fourth engine of disturbance and ill-will the triple vexation upon the municipal election, the school board election, and the Parliamentary election, till the becanvassed people of England lose all elasticity, all originality, all spirit under the leaden weight of the perpetual ballot box. Beware,

brother Churchmen, of being brought down into becoming mere electing animals. Human nature has higher, worthier needs than the petty machinery of compulsory Church councils. Churchmen can consult without stereotyped councils, and they will suffer loss and deterioration if they let the delicate bloom of voluntary co-operation be rudely brushed off. People talk as if there were not legal Church councils now. What is the parish vestry, that ancient constitutional institution, but the recognised Church council, in which the parson, the squire and churchwardens, with all their neighbours who care to join them, have the right and means of deliberating? As practical people, stick to the old thing and work it out before you embark on novelties. But there is the craving for sympathy and organised help. Have you not got organised help now? Have you not your various societies, with the infinite excuses which they offer for bringing neighbours together? Has not the clergyman, if he has any instinct of human nature, unlimited opportunities of inviting the principal, the most consequential people of the parish, into his parlour, of sitting down and crossing his legs, and there not disdaining to borrow that flavour of Yorkshire or Devonshire, or of whatever the dialect may be, talking to them in an understandable tongue, entering into their difficulties, and as he sympathises, bringing them sympathetically round to his views? They may call it tea at the parson's, but is it not as true a parochial council as if it had been legitimated by ten thousand Acts of Parliament? Shut your minds to the stiff, pedantic term "council." I know the "great council of the Nation;" I sit in it half the year. There is the Privy Council, and the Common Council, and there are councils of this and that society. For four or five farmers to be legislated into a council is a playing at big words. The vestry we understand; and, where we have no vestry, the "meeting" we understand. Do not call on Hercules to pull your cart out of the rut; do not stand up and say that a thing to do any good must have legal and Parliamentary title. If it is all this, it is stereotyped, and if it is stereotyped it cannot fit half the cases which you mean it to fit. In one parish, the nominee form of council will be obviously the best: in others, the elective. I am not afraid of being called a reactionary for expressing the opinion that while I believe in the elective, I equally believe in the nomination principle. There are plenty of places where either form is best. I would no more go for an Act of Parliament to regulate Church councils than I should go for an Act of Parliament to regulate Church Congresses. Fancy what the Church Congress would turn out if it were to be regulated by Act of Parliament. Let us condescend to the experience of our actual pursuit, and draw wisdom from work on which we are now so busy. We know that the Church Congress exists and flourishes, because it breathes the breath of free life. So will it be with your council; so is it with diocesan conferences. Their creation was spontaneous: copy them, and do not puzzle your heads about this Act or the other. Confer with your parishioners: trust them, and they will trust you. Meet them as you can and where you can; discuss with them, as you are men of sense, changes in the hours of service, changes in the hymnal and the musical portion of worship, in short, all which may be summed up as "reforms" by its friends, and "innovations" by its enemies; but be certain that the more free your intercourse is, the better it will be. No sane man has ever thought of bringing a bill into Parliament to regulate and schedule the conjugal confidence of man and wife. Why should our busy-bodies clamour for an Act of Parliament to regulate the confidence of the parson and of his spiritual wife, the parish?

Rev. E. W. MAKINSON, Sowerby, near Halifax.

I HAVE listened to this discussion, being a plain country parson myself, till I felt in the same condition as Warren Hastings, when he was impeached by the great orator, Edmund Burke, and was at last obliged to think himself that a great deal of what was said was true. For, sir, have we not had, in the early part of this discussion, the clergy set forth as existing and exacting in a manner that was disgraceful? We are coming now, I think, to a better state of things, and we have to thank the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and whose practical good sense has given a practical turn to the discussion. In matters of finance, I cannot quite agree that all the clergyman has to do is to go to his banker, and his banker will finance for him: he will finance very well if he has a balance on the right side. In most cases, however, a clergyman has to find the money, and he certainly does require a Church council to confer with him in all those matters that are not spiritual, and do not belong to the highest discharge of his duty. In all these parishes we have a great amount of torpor. Mr. Barker said that hardly a person came to his meeting. Of course not; our parishes have not been educated to take a part in the management of our resources, and for some time you will certainly require a rudimentary, a tentative Church council. You will require a council, I am sure, for the most part, that shall be an introduction, if you like, to your further legal constitution. The Church has been abused because she takes the *via media*. Well, to bring matters to a practical operation, that which I have found best in a parish is this:—You have, first of all, your council. Your vestry will not do: it meets only once a year. But you have surely the parson at the head; you have surely your churchwardens; sometimes you have your schoolmasters, and so forth. Why cannot you, without either exactly nominating yourself, or without plunging your parish into the turmoil of an election, manage to turn those persons, and others of an official character, into your Church council? It has very properly been said—Have we not elections enough? Your Local Board elections, with the meetings at the public-house? Have you not your School Board elections, with all the expenses, and noise, and turmoil that occur? Have you not your Municipal and Parliamentary elections? Are we to have a new system of election in every parish—a parish with its single hostelry—a parish with its division of farmers on this side or that? Are you going to have the trouble of an election every year, for the sake of this Church council? I can only say, myself, that if anything should disturb my poor parish, I shall have to wash my hands of the whole concern, and let those who like squabble, if they leave me to go about my business in peace. I cannot, however, see any objection to this Church council, constituted on ordinary lines. They may do a great deal, and they have done a great deal. It has been said we have too many diversities. Well, if you have so many persons you will have diversity. Some will be for reading the Psalms, and some, with a little more music in their souls, will want them sung. You will not get rid of diversity by increasing the number of opinions, but you will take a great load from the mind of the parson. I think that, as a consultative body if you please, it will be of great value to the incumbent who wishes to work more with the will of his parishioners. But if you get the Act of Parliament for making legally-constituted tribunals, with an election, and all the turmoil in the various parishes, we shall be leaping with a vengeance out of the frying-pan into the fire.

But let us try changes more gradual. Let such as are not at present satisfied, try a Church council, meeting quarterly or monthly, and with its meetings preceded and closed by a short devotional service. Let its members consist of the churchwardens

and sidesmen ; a representative from the Sunday school teachers, the choir, the district visitors, and other Church workers ; a treasurer of the various Church funds (S.P.G., or C.M.S., or A.C.S.) &c. The clergyman with any amount of tact will soon, by means of this body, know the mind of his people on any subject : he will be delivered from a large amount of money cares ; and can make necessary changes with the due concurrence, and, therefore, with the moral support of this Church council.

The Right Rev. S. T. NEVILL, D.D., Lord Bishop of Dunedin.

I LABOUR under the disadvantage of only having been able to come into the hall a moment or two ago ; but I do not wish to lose the opportunity of saying one word upon this subject, inasmuch as when I was a rector in the diocese of Lichfield, some ten years ago, I had myself in that parish an organisation which might well be called—in fact, was called—the Church council. I am not able to say whether it was the first of the kind that was instituted, but it certainly was amongst the first, and from that time I have never heard of any other. I shall not go, at any length, to prove the desirability of such a council, because I have been told by the chairman that I have but a minute or two in which to address you. In my opinion, the parochial council, constituted such as my own was, is a desirable thing. On the constitution of my own, I can say that it was composed of two elements—*ex-officio*, and others elected from the parish itself. The clergy of the parish were *ex-officio* members ; I had four assistant clergymen with me ; and the churchwardens, the secretary and treasurer of the school committee, the representative of the choir, the treasurer of the Missionary organisation of the parish, and so forth—these, by virtue of their office, became members of the parish council. Yet, inasmuch as they were elected to that office by the parishioners, they were also representative. I always found that any changes I wanted to introduce, or matters which appeared to me desirable to initiate, were fairly weighed and considered by that body. For example, when I thought it desirable to dispense with the use of the black gown in preaching—it was my own desire—I did not do it merely upon my own resolution, but I submitted the question to the parochial council ; and inasmuch as there were some there who did not approve of it at first, I allowed the matter to remain, and be discussed on one or two occasions, until I should get a unanimous vote. Then, when it was done, the parish at large made no objection whatever to the change, because they heard it had been approved by the council. But I wish to add this word of warning. I do not think such a body ought to become part of the legal constitution of the parish, as by any Act of Parliament. I think the great value of such an organisation is that it is a consultative body which the rector of the parish has chosen to call into existence, and which presents itself to every parishioner as being a concession, if I may use such a term, on his part, and evidencing a desire to move with the will of his parishioners ; and that is really the chief point of advantage in my mind in having such a body. I am not quite able to say with certainty, but I think it highly probable, that when Lord Sandon made some allusions to this subject in the House of Commons, he had my parish in his mind, because he was visiting it at the time the parochial council was in session, and it happened to be the subject of conversation at dinner.

The CHAIRMAN.

I AM asked to say that if any clergyman who has already established these councils, will send any rules that he may have, to the table, it will be satisfactory to some of the gentlemen in the room. I am pleased to see so many clergymen of the Church of England taking a liberal view of what ought to be done in reference to the present position in this matter. What was needed so many years ago we must consider is not applicable for ever; and I do think members of the Church of England are doing wisely in seeing if they cannot give a broader management and arrangement of Church matters than we have hitherto possessed.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 3rd, 1878.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF MANCHESTER took the Chair
at 2.30 P.M.

CATHEDRALS AND CATHEDRAL INSTITUTIONS—HOW
TO INCREASE THEIR INFLUENCE.

PAPERS.

The Very Rev. the DEAN OF CHESTER.

THERE is great advantage in viewing the Church Congress as a continuous institution. Year by year, though in one sense always changing, it is in another sense always the same. Some have thought that this yearly recurrence is too frequent and rapid, and have recommended that it should meet triennially. In theory there is much to be said for this view; but, practically, if Church people come together every year, in great numbers and with keen interest, and in different parts of the country—as last year at Croydon, the year before at Portsmouth, this year at Sheffield—it is difficult to interrupt the flow of the stream, and to store up its waters in separate and distant reservoirs. One benefit of this continuity is that a subject which requires prolonged and careful consideration can be brought, with as much frequency as seems desirable, before public notice, so that the progress of opinion regarding it may be watched and directed, till the question which it involves becomes ripe for action. Such a subject is this which we are now about to handle—“Cathedrals and Cathedral Institutions: How to increase their Influence.” This question has been discussed at five meetings of the Church Congress; and the progressive change of public opinion in regard to it may be traced by reading the reports of these meetings, in conjunction with an observation of facts in our

cathedral cities. Relatively it fills a far larger space than formerly in the Church-thought of the day. It is observable that at the first four meetings—at Cambridge and Oxford, at Manchester and Bristol, two centres of learning and two centres of industry—the subject was not touched at all. And, further, when it was definitely included in the programmes at Norwich and York, I think I am correct in saying there was somewhat of an apologetic tone in its treatment. *Now* hardly any one would speak apologetically for Cathedrals. It seems to me that he would be either a very bold man, or a very timid one, who should do so. *Now* cathedrals are regarded as almost the most animated and interesting of our general Church-system; and it is now on the whole apprehended—in some places, perhaps, obscurely, but in others very clearly—that cathedral life is not a mere amplification of parochial life, but something (though in a friendly, not a hostile, sense) generically different. Probably it would be admitted by most thoughtful observers that what we now want, in respect of our cathedrals, is not to cut down to a level of decent dignity what is avowedly useless, but to give scope to what, under unfavourable circumstances, has been proved to have a vigorous life—not to use these institutions as a quarry from whence to build something else—not to maintain them simply as picturesque ruins, which, in a purely poetical sense, it would be sacrilege to destroy—but to consider carefully how they can be brought out into greater activity still, and made more useful to the Dioceses to which they severally belong. Attention is invited by these remarks to the fact that the Church of England is not merely an aggregate of parishes, each of which ought to be well organised, but an aggregate of dioceses, each of which ought to be well organised—that diocesan organisation is quite as essential as parochial organisation—and that our theory of cathedrals is altogether anomalous and incorrect, unless they are viewed as essential parts of this organisation, and properly placed in the very heart of it. A few years ago it might have been bad policy to say this; now it is not only good policy, but an imperative duty. There is another circumstance which clearly manifests the new attitude assumed by this question in relation to the mind of the Church. Our bishops have now begun to visit their cathedrals officially. This is a strong indication of a change in opinion; for bishops, in such matters, if they are prudent, are not generally in advance of public sentiment, though, if they are vigilant, they ought to be on a level with it. Those who take an interest in this subject, and have not seen the charges of the Bishops of Winchester and Carlisle, published this year, will thank me for asking their attention to them. The utterances of these two prelates are of peculiar value, not only on personal grounds, but because they have had experience of cathedrals—the former as a Canon of Exeter, the latter as Dean of Ely. My purpose in this paper is to submit to the consideration of the Congress a few remarks on cathedrals viewed simply as diocesan institutions—helping the bishop on the one hand, and, on the other, aiding to bind together the clergy and laity of the dioceses in which they are placed. This is precisely what

our cathedrals are not now. At the same time it is precisely what we most want, and precisely what cathedrals were originally. There are various ideas of a cathedral in the minds of men; and this is inevitable, for a complete cathedral institution is manifold in its character. I do not undervalue any of these ideas because, for lack of time, I dwell only on one. That mode of increasing the influence of these institutions which I offer to your thoughts, seems to me the most urgent, the most practical, and the most likely to lead to further improvements; and, though it invites legislation, it involves much that is possible without legislation. A cathedral might be regarded as a place for daily worship; but this view would be both inadequate and incorrect. If a cathedral institution would be very imperfect without this, we are thankful to know that many churches have this without being cathedrals. The musical aspect of cathedrals is extremely important, but it does not furnish us with their definition. Such institutions might be highly developed without music; and music may be highly developed in parish churches. A cathedral may be made to foster and promote general education; and work of this kind is now advancing under such shelter, as at Carlisle, Bristol, and Chester; but this does not constitute the essence of a cathedral. Neither do we describe their essential character, when we regard them as "schools of the prophets," where theological students are trained, as at Lincoln, for holy orders, though here we approach more nearly to our point. Nor is the true conception of a cathedral reached, when we view it as a centre for missionary work in its diocese, though here we are nearer still to what we seek. The *ecclesia cathedralis* is the Diocesan Church. It represents the *cathedra*, or seat of the bishop. The dean and the canons are the bishop's council, to aid him in his deliberations and his work, to relieve his isolation, and to bind him closely with his diocese. This is, historically, the primitive notion of cathedrals. The diocese was anterior to the parish. In fact, parishes did not exist till over large areas efficient work had long been done from the diocesan centres. I am far from saying that we ought to go back to this state of things. It is seldom desirable that ecclesiastical history should reproduce itself. But we cannot properly appreciate the true meaning and function of cathedrals without having regard to their origin. This original office, too, of cathedrals is, if I am not much mistaken, exactly that of which we most stand in need at this period in which we live. In the times that are coming, whatever the relations of Church and State may be—and I am not at all disposed to be an alarmist—what we are likely to require most, in the ecclesiastical sense, is organised strength in our dioceses. We ought to aim at the re-establishment (so to speak) of each cathedral in the diocese to which it belongs. A few years ago any cathedral might have been transplanted and taken out of its diocese without any great consciousness of diocesan change. Even now the ties which bind cathedrals to their local environment are looser than they ought to be. They still need to be more organically connected with their bishop, on one side, and with the clergy and laity around them on the other. A reminiscence,

indeed, of what these institutions used to be, and what they ought to be again, is preserved in the cathedrals of the old foundation. In this arch-diocese of York, the Minster has always had its large body of prebendaries or canons, constituting a really numerous chapter. They are all summoned to meetings; they all join in the *congé d'élire*; they all appoint to livings; they are all in turn called up to preach; they all elect their proctors to Convocation; and if they do not debate on questions affecting property, this, I believe, arises merely from the fact that it is a delicate thing for non-residentiaries, who have no endowments, to take counsel in such matters for the residentiaries, who have. It was hardly possible for me, as a loyal Yorkshireman, to avoid making some reference to the Minster of which all Yorkshiremen are proud. But, our time being narrowly restricted, I desire to limit myself to cathedrals of the new foundation, and with special reference to the position of honorary canons. I confess that I have, in some respects, a preference for the system of the cathedrals of the new foundation, where, for instance, the precentor is a minor canon elected by the cathedral authorities on account of his musical skill and knowledge, not a canon appointed by the bishop or the Crown, irrespective of such powers. The statutes of the cathedrals of King Henry VIII. were made in times more nearly resembling our own than were those of the earlier; and these statutes appear to me marked by great wisdom, though, in some important respects, they seriously call for careful revision. As to the point before us, these more modern statutes show traces of that separation between the cathedral and the diocese which had already taken place in the middle ages. They contain no provision for canons or prebendaries who are not residentiaries. This state of things was remedied after a fashion, and, I presume to think, a very poor fashion, by the Cathedral Act of 3 and 4 Vict., c. 113. There, inasmuch as "it is expedient that all bishops should be empowered to confer distinctions upon deserving clergymen," it is enacted that twenty-four honorary canonries shall be founded in every cathedral church where non-residentary prebends or dignities do not exist; but it is added at the close of the section (23), "provided that no emolument whatever, nor any place in the Chapter of the Cathedral Church, should be taken or held by any honorary canon in virtue of his appointment as such canon." This is very peremptory; and I must say I heartily desire to see this provision repealed. It is, indeed, satisfactory to know that, even with this sharp line drawn between residentiaries and others, these honorary canonries are valued. They are marks of the bishop's confidence; and an instinct seems to say that to be connected, even slightly and externally, with the cathedral of a diocese is worth something; and this feeling shows that if the connection were closer and more real, very good results would follow. As to the general position of honorary canons, it is due alike to the Bishop who has chosen them, and to themselves also, that they should be treated with respect in the cathedrals with which they are associated. We live in a day when it is no longer desirable that capitular exclusiveness should

draw artificial lines, and when the cathedral should be viewed as the private chapel of the dean and residentiary canons. It is also very desirable that honorary canons should have some responsible duties to discharge for the diocese on the one hand, and in conjunction with the residentiaries on the other. As to endowments, when I mention this subject, I touch very delicate ground, and this in two respects. Let me say then that, while, as a general principle, it seems right that diocesan endowments should represent diocesan work, I think it wise that some canonries should be assigned on wider grounds. Who will say that it was a mistake to make Sedgwick Canon of Norwich, or Kingsley Canon of Chester? Again, as as to the number of residentiary canonries connected with our cathedrals, I heartily wish that number to be increased, and do not think we need despair of new endowments with such an end in view. Yet the question arises whether there might not be a better distribution of existing capitular endowments than that which we see at present. Taking £600 a year as the estimated value of a canonry, I am not sure that the assigning of this sum in payments of £50 a year to twelve honorary canons, or twice that sum to twenty-four such canons, might not result in greater strength to the diocese, and wider efficiency to the cathedral, than these aggregate amounts as assigned at present—while for the superintending of the services of the cathedral, and the care of its fabric, a dean and two canons, each residing eight months in the year, would amply suffice. The ruling idea which suggests such thoughts is entirely connected with diocesan organisation. I see nothing to hinder a bishop from calling together his honorary canons, for consultation, under his own presidency, on diocesan business. A legal opinion, indeed, has, I believe, been given to the effect that this is quite permissible. In the case of any business pertaining strictly to the cathedral, as in the duties connected with the *congé d'élire* or the election of proctors to Convocation, the dean would preside; but in matters relating to the diocese at large, the bishop would, of course, be at the head of what might correctly be called his greater chapter. Before such a chapter the Bishop of Winchester thinks it would be right to bring preliminary questions affecting matters of discipline. Again, a standing council would thus be constituted, which would be of high value for diocesan interests of various kinds. The proper relation of such a council to the diocesan synod and diocesan conference would be gradually perceived and defined through the experience which would grow out of such action. The combining of the dean and residentiary canons who are not parochial, in consultation with the canons who are parochial, would probably contribute independent opinions very useful in such conferences. Bishops are now in the habit of meeting their rural deans, and it is most desirable that they should do so. But meetings of the greater chapter would have a value of their own, because they would be more official, and, though not open to the public, they would have a public recognition. Without entering into further details, I confidently suggest that in such ways the bishop's hands would be strengthened, mutual confidence would be increased, the clergy and

laity would be drawn more closely together, and the cathedral would gradually become a living part of the diocese in which it stands. Thus, too, the conviction would grow that an honorary canonry is something more than a mere floating honour, dimly connected with our ancient cathedrals, made conspicuous for a moment on great days, and then fading away into indistinctness, and not connected with any work or any responsibility. I may without impropriety refer to certain steps which have been taken towards these ends in the diocese of Chester. I have been studious to show respect to those whom the bishop has been pleased thus to connect with our cathedral. Their titles are now inscribed on the stalls of the beautiful woodwork of our choir—the most beautiful woodwork, I believe, in England. The honorary canons, on their own part, do us frequently the favour of preaching in our cathedral; and now they have formally communicated with us regarding the efforts which it is desirable to make, under the bishop's sanction, towards the formation of a greater chapter; and this subject is to be carefully discussed amongst us next month: nor do I doubt that our conclusions, whatever they may be, will, at the proper time, receive a most willing consideration from our bishop. I am quite aware that what is here indicated cannot be fully done without legislation. But without legislation a great approach can be made towards the realising of such a result; and it is useless to legislate in advance of public opinion. Much, however, can be done in this matter by voluntary methods to ascertain and mature public opinion. When it is clearly seen that benefits are likely to arise from a new course of procedure, a good preparation is made for legal sanction. I believe this kind of tentative action in different dioceses separately gives us the best hope of success. Still I hope that this subject will be brought before long under the notice of our Northern Convocation. If it is then favourably received, a new and very definite step will have been made in the direction along which we are looking. It has been suggested that a very simple enabling Act might secure to us all that we need. Let me add, that it is highly important, if new legislation on this subject does take place, that cathedrals of the new foundation should obtain power to submit a revision of their statutes to competent authority. Such a power was once nearly obtained, and was lost simply in consequence of a political crisis, as was pointed out by the Bishop of Carlisle, when this general subject was under discussion at York. If such power of revision is granted, it is of great consequence that provision should be made against too marked a diversity in the results, as between one diocese and another. In any case, it is to be hoped that in all revision and all legislation of this kind, due regard will be paid to the position of honorary canons, and to the need of our having truly diocesan chapters. All this practically touches a very important ecclesiastical question, with which we are happily now face to face. By the good management of the present Government, for which we ought to be very grateful, we have the expectation of seeing four new bishoprics speedily constituted. Some people talk of this subject in a wild way, as though it were necessary that each of these new bishops must have

a cathedral, with its dean and canons, precisely of the modern pattern—a cathedral with which the bishop has very little to do, a dean isolated from the diocese, and canons who have no diocesan responsibility—and this, it is added, would be an expensive luxury. Now I think it would be much better that each of these new bishops should at first have no such cathedral and chapter at all: for they would cost a large sum of money at a time when money is very difficult to get, and they would not strengthen the bishop's hands for his new work. What is wanted is a really diocesan chapter: and it seems to me a great advantage for these new bishops that they will begin with no chapter, and can build one up, according to the pattern of earlier ages, and with strict reference to modern requirements. If this plan is followed in the four new dioceses which are about to be formed, I should expect the result to react very usefully on our cathedrals of the new foundation, and to promote the re-incorporation into the dioceses in which they are placed. At all events, the new bishop will have a golden opportunity in this respect, as in others. We see what is going on at Truro; and if Bishop Benson follows the line of the cathedrals of the old foundation, this is very natural after all that he did at Lincoln. Moreover, the chapter of Exeter, out of which the new chapter of Truro is in a certain sense to grow, belongs to the old foundation. It is by no means necessary that all cathedrals should be alike; but it is very necessary for our religious well-being that the different parts of each diocese should not be disjointed from one another, but that, in the ecclesiastical sense as well as in a high spiritual sense, the whole body in each one of them should be “fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth.”

REV. CANON GREGORY, St. Paul's Cathedral.

WHAT is the special end that cathedrals and cathedral institutions ought to answer? Until we have a definite answer to this question, we cannot even attempt to show how their influence may be increased.

It will help us to such reply if we dwell for a moment on the picture which the Church ought to present to the world. Our Lord prayed that His disciples might be one, that this unity of theirs might lead the world to believe on Him. In a spiritual body like the Church, this unity must rest upon oneness of faith, sympathy, and community in work; upon mutual co-operation, respect, and love, fostered by fellowship with a common Head as well as with one another, and manifested by perpetual acts of kindness and consideration on the part of all to each. It cannot be very real or deep or persuasive if it is made to rest upon mere dry obedience to authority, enforced as the world compels obedience to its mandates. The Church's unity should resemble that of the human body, where each limb and muscle contributes its share to the mani-

festation of the common life, and delights to do so by fulfilling its own office; not the unity of a regiment of soldiers, which has to depend upon martial law and the terrors of coercive measures.

To preserve the unity of the Church, therefore, much more is required than the exercise of authority, the setting forth of the law, the compelling all to keep within regulation limits. There is needed such intercourse and inter-communion as shall lovingly overcome that tendency to individualism and isolation which is so natural to men. This is found for us in the well-organised parish, where the individual members of Christ's flock are gathered together in the parish church by its recognised clergy for prayer and for praise, for instruction in the faith, and for participation in the sacraments; where offices and works of love and sympathy are fulfilled by all according to their several ability; where perpetual meetings for devotion, for mutual consultation, for reporting upon work done, or discussing work to be done, are ever binding together the more active and prominent members of the spiritual body, and through them the less active ones by whom each one of the more energetic is surrounded. For the most part the unity of our well-worked parishes is striking and satisfactory; speaking generally, those within their limits find places in their organisation, and nothing is more remarkable than the comparatively small amount of active opposition which is found within their borders.

When the unity has to be extended further, greater difficulties arise. Parochial zeal has a tendency to make men narrow, and limit their interests and sympathies to the sphere of their personal labours, and to their immediate fellow-workers. The clergy are accustomed to exercise a commanding influence, each in his own sphere; the laity to concern themselves about the persons and institutions with which they have a direct personal connexion; and so both the one and the other are in danger of regarding their parish as their Church, and the limited organisation of which they are influential members as of more importance than the larger organisations—the diocese and the Church—of which they are not less certainly members, but in which their position is necessarily less defined and their influence less powerful.

It is an important part of the duty of the cathedral and its institutions to correct this tendency, and to bind together the various parishes, as the parishes collect and bind together the individual members of the body of Christ. This it has to do partly by what the cathedral is in itself and by what is done within its walls, and partly through the instrumentality of diocesan institutions, in the management and direction of which its officers take a leading part.

And first as to what the cathedral can do in itself. It is the seat of the bishop: his throne is set up within its walls; in it therefore it is to be expected that he will gather together his clergy for prayer and for consultation; for deepening the work of grace in their own souls, and for inciting them to labour more earnestly for the conversion and edification of the flocks committed to their charge. Those who teach others specially need the life of grace and of devotion to be quickened within their own souls, and where can they so

profitably meet for the advancement of this great end as in the cathedral church of their own diocese, and under the auspices of their own bishop? Then, again, how is it possible for a living, thinking body like the Church, to maintain its unity without consultation between its several members? We are warned against any seeking to be lords over God's heritage, and how can this danger be avoided without the patient discussion of the various anxious questions of the day, about which men feel strongly in different directions? When men meet, and all are persuaded of the earnestness and reality of those whom they meet, a desire is kindled to smooth over differences, to temper hostilities, to be tolerant and kindly; but so long as men live and act apart, seek to rule magisterially to gratify their own personal promptings, to bend others to their own will, instead of being ready to bear the burdens of the weak, to soften prejudice by love, and in all things to win others to Christ by showing forth that mind which was in Him, suspicion and distrust are certain to rule: the body of Christ will be threatened with rents, because the wholesome action of its common life cannot be brought to bear upon each individual member. Under the shadow of the cathedral and under the guidance of the bishop, such dangers might be averted by conference and consultation, by union in prayer and in sacraments of the various parts of the diocese, clerical and lay.

Then, further, the cathedral is represented by the chapter, including the dean, the canons, and the honorary canons. In this body should be gathered those who represent the *elite* of the working clergy of the diocese. The dean and the residentiaries ought to be men able and eager to make the cathedral the great representative Church institution of the diocese. As such it should set an example of what the Church's services ought to be in all their parts. Its music should not be confined to any one school or set of writers; but whatever is really good and admissible within an Anglican church should be heard within its walls, whilst the greatest care should be taken that the rendering of such services is perfect in its way. Place should be found not only for the finished service or anthem by professional singers, but also for the highest type of a simple parochial service by a band of volunteers. Nor should less care be taken to secure that the preachers in the cathedral should include the ablest and most efficient men in the diocese. The honorary canons may well be taken to represent those who in the various fields of active work are occupying the most prominent positions in the diocese. Amongst them we expect to find the rectors and vicars of most influence and authority, the principals of diocesan institutions, the head masters of great public schools and so forth. Out of such a staff the cathedral should have no difficulty in finding a never-failing supply of earnest and successful preachers.

As the affection of those whose frequent privilege it is to worship in the cathedral may be kindled and kept alive by this means, so it is most desirable to do whatever can be done to make its services a standard for other churches, and a help to raise and improve what is wanting in them. For this purpose it is helpful to encourage the religious societies which have an organisation in the diocese to hold

their annual solemn service in the cathedral, so that men of all schools of thought, who might not otherwise worship within its walls, may be invited to come there, and find in it a home for an object which really interests them. Then in some dioceses arrangements have been made for instructing and improving country choirs through the instrumentality of teachers sent forth from the cathedral; whilst in not a few there are great gatherings of choral associations, the members of which must be led to take increased interest in the mother church of the diocese by being assembled within its walls for one great, united musical act of worship.

But the unity of a diocese has to be preserved by community of work and sympathy of action; and to the furtherance of this the staff of a cathedral can efficiently minister. Beside common works which can only be undertaken by the collective diocese, such as diocesan training colleges, or colleges for the training of candidates for holy orders, or the inspection of the religious instruction given in our primary schools, there are parochial works which imperatively demand united effort. In some things this has happily come to be recognised. During the last few years there have been founded in most dioceses associations for assisting in the erection of new churches and the restoration of old ones; for helping towards the provision of parsonage-houses where none exist, and for the increasing of the endowments of very poor benefices; for furthering the erection of schools and school-houses. It is right that such associations should exist, for it is notorious that some parishes have a large number of wealthy residents, whilst others are peopled only by the poor; that some churches have been liberally endowed by the piety of good men in past ages, whilst others have little or no income from any source. And it is equally certain that all churchmen are deeply interested in the welfare and progress of the Church in every part of the diocese and in every portion of the kingdom. This being the case, it is strange that so little has been attempted to grapple with some of the most crying needs that are to be found in the weakest part of the Church's system. The assumption seems to be general that the diocese can only assist and further local effort, and that where there is no local zeal the diocese is powerless. Thus whilst diocesan institutions will liberally help towns or neighbourhoods where local zeal is seeking to make provision for the spiritual wants of increasing populations, nothing is done for places too dead, too apathetic, or too poor to help themselves. Their wants remain unknown and unrecognised for years, if there is no active clergyman or no earnest layman to dedicate himself to the work of caring for them. So, too, with regard to primary education. It is the parishes most largely inhabited by the poor that demand the most primary schools, and yet it is such parishes which are least able to provide or maintain them. But so far as I know, it is in the metropolis alone that the difficulties such parishes experience in sustaining their schools have been recognised, and that any real effort has been made to assist school managers who are labouring to continue to the poor the power of having their children taught in the Church's creeds. In other parts of the

country it would seem as though the diocese contentedly acquiesced in the Church's schools in poor or apathetic parishes, built at great cost, and essential for the preservation of the faith of the rising generation, being handed over to a system of instruction from which the inculcation of all definite religious truth is rigorously excluded. The fear lest a few selfish men should throw upon the more liberal a portion of the obligation which they themselves should discharge, acts as a powerful deterrent from the performance of a high Christian duty: whilst the thought that if the piety of the diocese does not liberally interfere, a number of children will be deprived of all real knowledge of the saving grace of our divine Lord, is not found to act as a sufficient antidote: and so there is danger lest in our day the poorest parishes, where there is special need that the children should be religiously and virtuously brought up, because they will probably have around them the fewest examples of Christian holiness to draw them into the right path, the schools should know only that make-believe kind of religious teaching, which is called undenominational religion. Christianity it cannot be called, for Christianity is essentially a religion with doctrines. And yet what could more effectually minister to the unity of the Church in a diocese than the clear manifestation of an interest in the poor, neglected, godless portions of it by those which are more favoured? What a stimulus would it give to the hard-working, toil-worn parson of a poor and populous parish, struggling to maintain his parish schools for Christ and His little ones, to feel that the diocese was interested in his exertions, and would hold out a helping hand: what comfort and support would it afford to the lonely worker in apathetic or unsympathising neighbourhoods, to realise that in the Church of the diocese he would find hearty and sympathetic fellow-worshippers, and in the organisations connected with it material help and friendly assistance whenever he required it: what a trumpet-call to diligence and earnest effort would the careless and apathetic hear in the united efforts of the parishes around, working in connection with the cathedral organisation, to discharge more worthily the duties of their office!

Besides this there are important works for developing the power of usefulness in the Church and in increasing its efficiency which have not yet been attempted. There is the higher field of education, which the Church is as much bound to consider as the lower. The upper classes need a sound religious education as much as do the lower. The female portion of the population requires thought and attention with respect to their education not less than the male. Other bodies in the community have seen this, and have recently made some earnest and successful efforts to make provision for this great want. But as yet the Church has founded few schools for education of boys or girls of the upper classes. And why? Chiefly I believe because it is the diocese which has to move and not the parish. The wealthy do not live in such large numbers in any one parish as to make it the bounden duty of the vicar of that parish to supply a school. There must be united action, the combination of many parishes, or, best of all, the action of the whole diocese, to

supply what is required ; and because such united action is needed, nothing is done.

Then again, how greatly do we want a thorough revision of parochial divisions in our more populous dioceses. Population has increased ; churches have been multiplied ; boundaries have been formed when all the surroundings of the church and parish were quite different to what they now are. People complain that these arrangements have become antiquated and inconvenient, that they ought to be re-adapted to meet present wants : the Church's work is not so well done as it might be ; but it is no one's business to amend what is defective. The task would be a difficult and a troublesome one. There would be heart-burnings and complainings. It could only be accomplished by some one in authority. And so it is not done.

Now why should not the cathedral be made instrumental for remedying these and other admitted defects ? Why should not its dignitaries be occupied in assisting to remove the evils which interfere with the efficient carrying out of the Church's work, and in promoting such general efforts as are needed to enable the strong to help to bear the burdens of the weak ? Their position gives them more power of labouring effectively at such works than can be possessed by the chance clergyman who is moved by zeal and love for the Church to undertake such portion of this duty as he is able or allowed to discharge. I believe that in one northern diocese the bishop is seeking to fill up the canonries in the cathedral as they fall vacant with an eye to such work as I have spoken of, and most heartily must all earnest Churchmen wish him success. In England very much more can be accomplished when those in authority will undertake the irksome and laborious task of supplying deficiencies, than when the responsibility is thrown upon a staff of officials, however disinterested and excellent, or the fortuitous help of men not directly pointed out by the offices they fill for the work that they are so good as to undertake. It is this which has given the parish so much advantage over the diocese. For hitherto in the parish there has been the rector or the vicar, who is the obvious person to do what has to be done, and who has done it ; whilst in the diocese there have not been in the same manner those who from position and leisure have felt themselves called upon to undertake the same responsibility.

But before the cathedrals can discharge these or any other good offices for the Church, it must be fully recognised that they have a place in the Church's system, that they are not merely intended to furnish names of honour or positions of emolument for clergymen of distinction or ability. Hitherto it can scarcely be said that this has been recognised. Canonries have been regarded as dignified sinecures, and as such have been given to clergymen already fully occupied with other duties, and for the most part without any thought as to their suitability for the special duties which as cathedral dignitaries they would be called upon to fulfil. I do not hesitate to say that the union of the two offices—canon residentiary and parish priest—is practically to make the man who is called upon to

discharge them, not merely less efficient in both capacities than he would be if he had to fulfil one only, but almost if not quite useless in both if he seeks to discharge the duties of both; whilst the second office becomes a sinecure, if his thoughts and labours are absorbed by attention to the duties of one of his offices. Few men, if any, have the elasticity of mind requisite for the consideration and development of plans for making each of the two offices as fruitful in good as it might be made; whilst it is certain that no one will have that amount of time at his disposal which is absolutely necessary for carrying into effect such plans as thought and experience would suggest as desirable for thoroughly utilising the influence which is attached to the two positions.

To make our cathedrals, therefore, the centres for such practical goods as I have named, two things are essential.

1st. That the canons residentiary should fill no other offices, but should dedicate their whole time and thought to making the cathedral which they represent as efficient for the benefit of the diocese as is possible. To such an extent has this been ignored that some cathedrals have only one residentiary house attached to them, so that only one of the canons can by any possibility be in residence at the same time. I should not hesitate to say that when one residentiary house is sufficient, one residentiary canon is all that ought to be appointed. Deeply should I lament the diminution of the dignity and power of usefulness which would result to a cathedral from such a diminution in the number of its chief officers; but the undivided efforts of one man during the whole of the year could work far more good for the cathedral and diocese than the spasmodic exertions of four during a short three-monthly course, at the expiration of which their time and attention are absorbed by other pressing duties for the rest of the year. As mere ornamental appendages of the Church, we may rest satisfied that cathedral dignitaries cannot long exist, except as honorary officers; but if it be once recognised that there is work most important for the Church which they and they only can fulfil, then their office must be placed in such a position that they may be enabled to discharge its duties. The Cathedral Act was passed when cathedral dignities had become mere sinecures, and cathedrals appeared as costly excrescences in the Church's system, and accordingly their incomes were cut down to a minimum, and it was supposed that the best end they could answer would be the furnishing a provision for men engaged in other and ill-paid duties, or in providing for able men worn out with other labours. Now that our cathedrals are showing life, and have officers seeking to discharge the functions which they were appointed to discharge, it surely is not too much to hope that the whole question will be reconsidered, and dealt with in a different spirit. If it be objected that in some rural dioceses there would not be occupation for the present number of canons in works such as I have named, then I should rejoice to think that in them some small provision might be made for the encouragement of theological learning. For never let it be forgotten that the Church needs for the preservation of her unity, as well as for the edification of her members, men of learning

and research, of natural ability and acquired knowledge, who can devote their time to accurate investigation and laborious thought, and then make others sharers of their labours. The caviller and the sceptic need to be answered; the discoveries of science and the revelations of the gospel require to be harmonised; the irreverent and destructive theories of those who seek to use human learning for the injury or overthrow of Divine truth demand patient examination and skilful exposure; the spiritual wants of believers in each generation require the adaptation for them of the ancient verities. And how can such works be undertaken without leisure and freedom from other cares?

The 2nd, and perhaps the most important requirement is that men shall be selected for cathedral offices who have the necessary qualifications to discharge them ably. When such positions are treated as mere patronage, and given away without thought of the duties to be performed, but only of the persons to be benefited, it necessarily follows that they sink into uselessness or contempt. The possession of an office does not supply a man with the requisite ability to perform it; the being clothed with certain powers does not secure that they shall be properly discharged.

Whilst therefore a cathedral and its officers may be made invaluable for binding together the several portions of a diocese, and for enabling the members of Christ to realise their union in His One Body, it is certain that such benefits will not be realised unless the right men are selected to carry on the work, and unless they have secured sufficient leisure to enable them to carry on that work efficiently.

ADDRESSES.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE, M.P.

AS THE Dean of Chester truly said, the cathedral question has risen into far more conspicuous prominence than that which it had attained when first started at Church Congresses. Even since we last debated it, there has been a new and an essentially important departure in its relations to the Established Church. Formerly, all that practical men could discuss was how best to improve our actual chapters. Since then the foundation, not of four, as the dean said, but of six new bishoprics—for St. Alban's and Truro were only the first instalment of the progressive scheme of the present Government—involving, as it does, six new chapters, has made capitular development, both in theory and in practice, as immediate a consideration as any which occupies public attention. Of those six new chapters, the future chapter of Truro has received a definite constitution by Act of Parliament. In the five other sees the rudimentary chapter exists in the canons. Honorary canons, of course, may easily be called canons—and these provision made, also by Act of Parliament, enabling the bishops to create honorary canons, meeting in or about the cathedral, are subject to no penal consequences if they call themselves a chapter. In fact, the chapter, in some way or other, exists for all the sees, though in the most complete form for Truro. Seeing this—seeing the place which cathedrals have taken in the body politic—let me ask you, "What

are they?" They are the regulating, the moderating, and, at the same time, the elevating element in the Church corporate, whether viewed as the Church national or the Church catholic. They are the devotion of men's best things to God; they are the centre of God's highest and most frequent worship; they are the homes of those arts which God has given to the human intellect and the human imagination—to develop for the benefit of his creature man—architecture, sculpture, and painting, the homes of the eye; and music, the lessons of the ear. They are the schools of the prophets and the storehouses of learning. But above all this, they are the institutions which give constitutional balance to the sacred organisation. They stand between the autocratic bishop and the demurs of presbyters and laymen. They are the bishop's councils—his eyes, his assistants—the assistants it also may be, and ought to be, of the laity and clergy at large, as a fearless assessorship, which may plead for justice on the one side, and for mercy on the other, and for wisdom all round. They are the uniting bond of all the administrators in the diocese, the gathering point of all who bear a ruling share of its burden.

Here I may hint to my friend, the Dean of Chester, that I think he must have written his paper a few years ago, and treated it as being like wine—the better for keeping. He said there were, in the cathedrals of the new foundation, canons residentiary and honorary canons, and he wished something could be done to introduce an approximation to the original system of the canons, under varied conditions, forming the greater chapters of the old into the cathedrals of the new foundations. In this I thoroughly agree with him. He pleaded for permissive legislation for the object. Let me point out to my friend that his prayer has been answered—several years before he sent it up. That permissive legislation is on the statute book. An Act of Parliament to concede and regulate all that he asks for passed in the session of 1873. The member who introduced and carried it is now occupying your ears; and the member who supported him, by backing it with his name, is now First Lord of the Admiralty; the Home Secretary who advised the house to pass it is now Lord Aberdare; the peer who carried it through the House of Lords is now Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; the member of the House of Lords who rendered efficient help to it, by referring it to a select committee, was then, and is now, Archbishop of Canterbury. You will find on the musty records of ancient Parliaments, that in the Cathedral Act of Lord Melbourne's days there is a perfectly unworkable provision for reviving "suspended" canonries, under conditions which made the process one which was safe never to be worked. "The Canonries Act of 1873" sweeps away all these obstacles; it enacts that, in the first place, in the cathedrals of both foundations, any "suspended" canonry may be revived, or non-residentiary "prebend" in one of the old foundations alienated and enforced to activity. It also enacts, in the second place—which applies primarily to cathedrals of the new foundation—that where there is no suspended canonry to be revived, a new canonry may be created. Now, what are the conditions? No limit, maximum or minimum, of endowments can be found still in the Act. The only provision is that some work shall be found for the new canon. That work is to be the *raison d'être* of the canonry. The relation of the new canonry to the existing chapter, and the canon's share of work, is to be regulated *pro de nata* in every case. The patronage of the canonry is so far limited, that if the canonry is to be attached to some already existing ecclesiastical institution, as the headship of a theological college, for instance, would be, it shall be still in the hands of the elector or electors of that office; but that, otherwise, the patronage must be vested in the diocesan or in the Crown. These are the only limitations found in the statute book. Thus, any cathedral of the old or of the new foundation has the power, under very easy conditions, of extending its chapter, and of

developing its operations in the direction where development is needed. My friend the Dean of Chester will easily realise that the Canonries Act has, in fact, almost reduced honorary canonries in existing cathedrals to the condition of ornamental appendages, for the chapters will not be enlarged by any transmutation of those offices, but by using the provisions of the Act of 1873. One cathedral has already taken advantage of the Act, and that is the cathedral of whom the senior canon has just been reading to us a paper. The Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, in connection with the Bishop of London, have founded a new canonry in their cathedral for the existing diocesan inspector of religious teaching, constructing it upon one of the prebends. One of the provisions of my Act, as I have explained previously, is that the non-residentiary prebendaries can be called up, so to speak, and become residentiary prebendaries or canons.

THE DEAN OF CHESTER.

I KNEW the law very well. What I said was, that I hoped that new endowments might come, in order that these canonries—

MR. BERESFORD HOPE.

I FELT that you simply wished me to explain the incident. With this newly-awakened zeal for cathedrals—with our cathedrals swept and garnished, and set in order—by that grand upheaval of material restoration which is a glory of our age—with this power of extending canonries in the old chapters—with the creation of the Chapter of Truro, by an Act of Parliament passed during last session without a division in either house, as had been the Canonries Act of 1873—what obstacle stands in the way of a complete development of the cathedral system? Only one thing is wanting—the hand plunged into the deep pocket and pulled out full. We have seen the bishopric of Truro founded by private munificence; we have heard of a great gift promised, and a large legacy bequeathed for the see of Newcastle-on-Tyne; we know that promises have been made which may speedily raise the spacious, cheerful, and well-ordered church of Wakefield to the rank of one of the cathedrals of the land. Do not be satisfied in those churches with the episcopate only, with its conventional chapter of honorary canons. The episcopate, taken by itself, no doubt is the foundation, but on the foundation the constitutional superstructure must be raised in that most popular of all organisations—a well-manned and fully-worked cathedral, with its chapters and its synods, its choral festivals and school gatherings, its ordinations and confirmations, its encouragement of piety and beauty, of research and education. Our Church is gasping for elastic comprehension—and where can so loving an embrace be sought as in the wide-spread arms of the mother Church? The sovereign remedy for the sores engendered by strife over ceremonies is the influence of a cathedral, with ritual dignified enough for the highest aspirations of our devotion, scriptural enough for the most searching scrutiny of biblical criticism, legal enough for the whole bevy of judges, and moderate enough for the most English taste. The cathedrals stand sure fortresses around the city of God, and beacon towers to guide all sick and weary souls to their daily communion—I use “communion” in the strictest sense of the word—with their Saviour and Consoler. Some of these you have inherited, some you are creating, all of them are the machines you must work—they are instruments of proof upon which you may rely in your conflict with the sceptical world, the luxurious flesh, and Satan. Thank God, the means of rightly using them have grown in our hands—it is for you to employ them to the uttermost.

The Right Rev. S. PERRY, D.D., Bishop of Iowa, U.S.A.

I REGRET exceedingly the necessity laid upon me of interrupting—for I must do so—this interesting and eminently practical discussion of the means of increasing the influence of cathedrals and cathedral institutions in England. We, in America, have hardly reached that stage of the discussion. We are now groping about and feeling after the cathedral itself; and we are looking to England for the means of founding our own cathedrals on a basis which may last and endure. In coming to England, the American tourist—the American Churchman—I speak from my own experience and that of many others I know—hastens from Liverpool that he may say his prayers in the ancient Cathedral of Chester: and not only is he sure of a warm welcome from the loving dean, so well known and heartily loved on our side of the water, but he feels that he can enjoy religious privileges and have religious experiences which are, in a great measure, denied him in his own land. I well remember turning over the musty pages of the diary of a convert to the Church some 150 years ago—one of the Independent ministers of New England, who gave up prominence and position in his own body that he might find his way to the Church. He came to England, and for the first time heard a cathedral service, and he records in the diary the deep impression made upon his mind when he was able thus to realise, as he thought, something of the nature of the worship of which he had read in the Word of God. We, coming to England—whether we look upon Chester Cathedral, now becoming more and more beautiful every day, or upon St. Paul's, crowning the hill in London, and raising its proud dome over that great commercial mart, showing that there, at least, religion is in its proper place, overlooking all that has been done around, beside, beneath it; or whether we wish to admire in its beautiful position, your York Minster, or in its magnificence your Lincoln Cathedral, like the beauty of Jerusalem coming down from heaven—we gratefully record our indebtedness to the English Church in the past for furnishing us with these means of stimulating our own aims of religious life, and for uniting with us as worshippers at the sacred shrine of beauty and devotion of ages long since past. But the American Cathedral is eminently a cathedral of the nineteenth century: and we look, as I have said before, to English authorities, as well as to English cathedral officials, to give us the means of moulding and shaping our cathedral institutions. When this visitor to England, whom I have mentioned, returned to his native land, he did not dream of establishing a cathedral—his modest episcopal income was less than that of the lowest curate in England—less than £100 a year; and on that sum he wandered throughout the land of New England, administering confirmation and holy orders, and accustoming the people to the idea of a bishop. But a Church which had scarcely any existence more than seventy-five years ago, is now in a position to think of securing cathedrals, and the Bishop of Illinois erected in the city of Chicago the first building which may properly be called an American Cathedral. It was erected by means procured by the bishop; it is entirely under his own control—he is practically both bishop and dean: this is the idea of an American Cathedral—that the bishop shall be the ruler of his own cathedral. That example has been followed in about sixteen of our dioceses, and more or less successful attempts have been made to do something for the cathedral system. Our plan has been, not to build large and costly edifices—we have not the means to do so, we have not the requirements necessary for it—but we have sought to make the cathedral a bishop's church—a place where he can hold ordinations, where will be found his seat and home when not engaged in his work of visitation, around which he may gather his educational, his charitable, and his missionary

institutions, where he can accustom his people, his candidates for holy orders, those who are engaged under the direction of the clergy of the cathedral, the young of the schools which have been established under the same control, in various charitable operations; where he can gather them for daily prayers, weekly or more frequent celebrations; where he may have in the centre of the diocese a typical service which shall be a model, and where he can have a place for the clergy to meet and see not only the bishop, but find there their own faith and zeal quickened as they see the Church growing in its very best state. That is what we are aiming at, and trying to establish. In my own see, beyond the Mississippi, where less than forty years ago the number of white inhabitants could be counted by hundreds, but where there are now two millions of white people, we have such a cathedral. It was built by offerings secured by my predecessor; and it received its impetus, and possibly its inception, in his mind from the conception he arrived at from the last Pan-Anglican Conference at Lambeth. Shortly after his return he secured large gifts; and, before he died, three years ago, he had caused to be erected and had consecrated the most beautiful church in the western part of the United States, which is the Cathedral of the diocese of Iowa. This building, which, when completed—it is now complete, save the spire—will have cost, with the land upon which it is placed, about 100,000 dollars, or £20,000—is entirely under the control, and is in fact the home of the bishop of the diocese, and he is therefore the master of his own cathedral. The dean, who is attached to the cathedral, has not the power which the English dean has—he has simply the power of representing the bishop during his absence, and of presiding in his absence in the chapter as the senior professor of the theological school of the diocese. The canons—four in number—are all engaged in educational work in the Diocesan College, or Theological School, or as clergymen ministering to the congregations of the see; and thus we have combined what we may call, or what has been called, the cathedral chapter—the chapter making them one and the same. And the church work in this centre of the diocese of Iowa is conducted on true Church principles, under the guidance and direction of the bishop, the clergy being practically responsible to him—all the clergy forming part of the cathedral chapter—forming his counsellors, his associates, his intimate friends: all receiving their stipends from the common treasury, all engaged in various departments of Church work—educational, missionary, or parochial. With this beginning, we have already commenced to gather about the cathedral the various works of churches, without which we can hardly hope to fulfil our mission for caring for the bodies as well as the souls of dying men; and I hope on my return to open our Church Home and Orphanage, the means for which have been nearly collected. This will be under the control of the cathedral chapter, and will form part of our cathedral work, and added to this there will be missionary work of a practical and personal nature among the Churchmen of the city, and in outlying districts, which are now more or less supplied with missionary services whenever the canons of the cathedral have a spare Sunday. Thus our work will be increased, and we shall be striving as far as we can, not indeed to popularise the cathedral, but to make it rightly to be said, to be ministering to the wants of the people. What has been done in Iowa has been done in a larger or smaller degree in about sixteen dioceses. On the New England frontier and coast, Bishop Neely has completed a cathedral of stone, and he is there accordingly forming his chapter about him. The Bishop of Albany having become the possessor of a disused foundry, has converted it into a cathedral, with a great school attached. It is not so unsightly as you might think. The Bishop of Minnesota has a cathedral—he is my nearest neighbour on the north—and it has grown out of the necessities of his great educational work amongst the boys and girls of his diocese. Among the Indians on the western frontier of Iowa, our Indian missionary bishop has formed

his missionary clergy into the cathedral chapter, and is there striving to organise the same kind of work, and is taking part in the reform movement which is now taking place in the neighbouring Republic of Mexico, where we have gathered together one hundred congregations. And where we have possession of a magnificent church in Mexico, the clergy have been organising for the consecration of the new bishopric into a cathedral chapter, and are working in that way at the very outset of the Church work in the Republic. The Bishop of Easton, who visited England at the last Pan-Anglican Conference—Bishop Langton—and whose tracts, no doubt, are read in England as they are in America—has put up a cathedral for work among the Africans, who form a large part of his diocese; and, although his cathedral will cost, I believe, only 700 dollars, or £120, yet I have no doubt it will be a centre of spiritual life and activity; for all that he does is instinct with spirit, love, and activity. In this way we are striving in America to follow after something met with here in grandeur and beauty. It is not time for us to build magnificent cathedrals; although I am happy to record that the Bishop of Long Island has just laid the foundation stone of what will be the finest cathedral of America—secured to him by the gift of one of the merchant princes of New York—the money for which in the end will amount to 1,000,000 or more dollars. I will detain you no longer, except to express the interest I feel in this discussion, and to hope that after this little episode as to what has been done in America, the discussion may revert to its natural channel.

MR. F. S. POWELL.

I CERTAINLY feel that some apology is due from me in presuming to follow those long experienced in cathedral work who have already taken part in this discussion. Nevertheless, having promised at the invitation of the committee to speak a few words, I venture to pronounce them. I must say that I have felt individually great satisfaction in finding that those who take deep interest in the future usefulness of cathedrals have not uttered one word of complaint or of censure upon the principle—taking that principle broadly, largely, and in the main—of some reduction of those great catholic establishments which our forefathers knew. I believe myself that amongst other circumstances of an external character which have given strength to the Church of England and caused development, none has been more valuable than the transfer of large revenues from the cathedrals and from the bishoprics to our parishes. I am certain of this, that in many of our cities and towns, churches which are now filled with numerous congregations would never have been built had not there been a certain and a sure prospect that in the course of a few years endowments would be found for these parishes from the ancient cathedral and episcopal funds. It appears to me that the first essential for the increased influence of our cathedrals is greater faith in cathedral institutions. I cannot entirely concur with what my friend the Dean of Chester said, when he suggested that no apologies were now required for cathedrals. So late as 1871, when great cathedral authorities made answers to questions submitted to them on the wish of the Prime Minister of that day by the Archbishop, there were given in reply apologies many; and certainly to my mind apologies most miserable. But since that time faith has become more abundant, and with a great abundance of faith there has arisen a large multiplication of works. I can remember, even in my short experience, the time when the great Cathedral of St. Paul's was little more than a monument to Christopher Wren and the depository of the bones of heroes; but at this hour at which we meet, that cathedral is the centre of a religious life than which none is

more active, and of religious teaching than which none is more animating or more powerful. It seems to me that in this matter, as in so many others, if we desire to reform and to perpetuate, we must have regard to first principles. The three first principles of cathedral life appear to me to be these:—first of all there are the relations between the chapter and the bishop, which I will describe in these general terms — that they should be friendly and consultative; secondly, the cathedral should be a great church for the whole of the diocese, and not only for the city wherein it is planted, or for the dignitaries who have official posts therein; and thirdly, it should be to the whole of the parishes of that diocese an example of the most dignified and religious form of divine worship. Now it is not inaccurate to say that during the late reforms or changes made in cathedrals, the first of these characteristics has been forgotten, the second has been well nigh abolished, and the third has been starved. And then surprise is felt that cathedrals have not, in the fullest degree, reached to the highest measure of their usefulness! The one function of cathedrals which has been maintained without interruption is that of worship; and looking back upon the dreary period of the eighteenth century from which we have, as regards the results of it, but lately emerged, this at least must be remembered as a circumstance most remarkable and most valuable as an instrument of good, that there has been preserved in our cathedrals a noble type of worship. Then there is one want perhaps more than any other in the present time in the Church of England, and that is the full and complete realisation of the diocese as a living force. We have in London great church societies; we have in both provinces meetings of convocation, most active and most energetic; and we have work in the parishes which it would not become me to praise; but we do yet want a realisation of diocesan life. And that being wanted it will be best given, I believe, by the external representation of the possibility, at least, of that life in an energetic cathedral system. I am anxious to be as concise as I can, and will indicate but one or two very simple principles by which the improvements I have sketched out may in some degree be accomplished. I am not one of those who are always panting for reform, invoking the aid of Parliament and of Government. I often think that if we worked with the materials we have we might improve in no ordinary degree, and with the results of the experience thus acquired aim at higher accomplishments. One reform which is essential to the efficiency of our cathedrals is in the disposition of patronage. Deans and canons should no longer be appointed because they have done some work of a good kind in some place or other; but they ought to be appointed to cathedrals in order to give strength and vitality to the cathedral system. And then, being placed in those positions, they should not be regarded as men who have a sinecure and are placed on the shelf; but, on the contrary, they ought to be viewed as men who have great opportunities of usefulness, and who if they make due use of those opportunities, have before them a career of the largest usefulness in the most dignified positions of the Church of England. I am sure that the Church of England has never felt regret that a Dean of Ely has been promoted to the Bishopric of Carlisle, and that a Dean of Carlisle has been advanced to the see of London and thence to Canterbury. The next reform ought to be this — that those who are canons residentiary should be canons residentiary not only in name but in fact; that whenever they accept that office they should dedicate themselves during the continuance of it to the cathedral work—to the cathedral work not necessarily as found within the cathedral alone, but also as indicating the close connection of the cathedral with the diocese. And that being the case there ought to be coupled with that reform another reform, namely, that these canons residentiary should not be mere isolated canons, but they should receive within the cathedral church—not once and again, but often—the most accomplished rectors

and vicars, and I will venture to add, sometimes, the most promising curates, to take part in the administrations of the cathedral. Thus you will have a life circulating—you will have the canons residentiary going into the diocese as friends and as helpers; you will have the clergy from the diocese going to the cathedral church, ministering therein, and received as honoured guests and equals by those who are permanently and during the whole year connected with the cathedral. And let me in my concluding remarks remind you of this circumstance, full, to my mind, of encouragement in this view of the subject, that Bishop Benson—the Bishop of Truro—no sooner obtained possession of his see, than he felt the necessity of gathering a chapter around him. He did it, coming from Lincoln, where, more than in any other cathedral church, ancient principles have been followed. He felt the force and the vitality and the value of these principles; and so far from being an apologist, so far from thinking a chapter an useless ornament, or even an incumbrance, he felt that he could not be the Bishop of Truro except he had gathered around him, for all the purposes which I have pointed out, gentlemen worthy of the high vocation, gentlemen possessed of varied accomplishments of learning, men who felt they had a work to do, and who, relying on their God, determined to be faithful labourers, resolved to accomplish that which they knew and felt to be a precious and a mighty task.

DISCUSSION.

REV. CANON TREVOR.

SOME years ago the subject we are now discussing was very much on the mind of the then Archbishop of York, and he devised and put in action a scheme for the accomplishment of the very objects which the Dean of Chester has now in view. I do not pretend to have been at all consulted on that scheme, but I have been honoured with a very humble post in the execution of it, and can explain its principal features in a few minutes. They will be found to comprehend much that has been now spoken of, and I hope my friend, Mr. Beresford Hope, will not think the worse of the plan for not being quite new. The fact is that the archbishop had the misfortune—you cannot call it his fault for he was a very old man—to die nearly 800 years ago. Indeed, it was exactly eight centuries ago, in the year 1078, that this cathedral and diocesan organisation was given to the Chapter of York, and it continues to this day. I cannot say in all its strength, for the life and power of it have been taken away by unwise reformers. But the frame is still in being and capable of being restored, to the great advantage of the cathedral and the diocese. Archbishop Thomas was the first appointment of William the Conqueror. He had a *tabula rasa* before him in the strictest sense, for not only had the cathedral and the city perished in the siege of York, but the Conqueror's wrath did not leave a single habitation standing between the Humber and the Tyne. The archbishop, who was a wealthy man, began by patching up the old English cathedral, the place of King Edwin's baptism—and replacing the seven Culdee canons who still represented the Celtic Christianity of the north of England. Having re-established the choir, the archbishop built on to it a stately Norman nave, and then proceeded to reconstitute the chapter. The parochial system had been introduced by Archbishop Egbert, and, with all its advantages, Archbishop Thomas was afraid of the rural clergy getting isolated from himself and his cathedral. There was no Public Worship Act to see that nothing was added, nothing omitted, in the celebration of the Liturgy. The country priest might forget how to sing the mass properly, or wear

the wrong vestment, or even fall from the faith and doctrines of the Church, from pure rustic isolation. The archbishop wanted to keep the country churches in active communion with the cathedral: with this object he enlarged the chapter, and divided the Church possessions in three parts; one for the archbishop, one for the cathedral services, and the third he distributed into prebends, which were in fact parochial charges, in different parts of the diocese. Every prebendary was a canon, and bound to reside at the cathedral for half the year; the other half he was to be at his prebendal church, where he had his permanent vicar for the parochial duties, he himself acting as rector and local ordinary. In this way, one half the chapter, fifteen or sixteen canons, with twice as many vicars choral, were to be always in residence at the cathedral, and the other half at their several country charges. There was a regular coming and going between the cathedral and the diocese, which must have been very much the thing we are now aiming at. I have not time to detail the steps by which this great scheme was corrupted and destroyed. The main abuse was non-residence, and it began with the bishops. Archbishop Thomas was a resident bishop. He was seldom at the king's court, or elsewhere out of his diocese, and as he held the see for thirty years, we may presume he had his chapter in good working order. But the Norman and mediæval prelates undertook a variety of state offices. They were chancellors, treasurers, justiciaries of the realm; they went ambassadors to foreign powers; they commanded armies in the field. All this kept them away from their dioceses. Deans and chapters, in place of the councils of resident diocesans, grew into independent corporations. Then these also began to be non-resident: they, too, undertook secular offices. In the 13th and 14th centuries, as many as forty cardinals of Rome held stalls in York Minster, and never came near it. In this way the residence sank down to one or two canons, and they the most obscure and the least thought of; the men of genius and talent going off to more distinguished stations. With his vicar choral in the minster and his parochial vicar on the prebend, the dignitary's conscience was satisfied, and neither cathedral nor diocese got the benefit of his presence, except perhaps at the tithe and rent audit. Then the Reformation came, involving all cathedrals and collegiate churches in some of the odium of the monasteries. Our Church's canons discourage cathedral residence, and it is to be "sorted out" to as few as possible: almost everywhere it has sunk to a single canon in residence. At the same time the prebends have become independent parishes, leaving the prebendary with no other concern in them than the profit and the patronage. In this state the last Cathedral Act disendowed and disembodied the prebends altogether, and the curious result is this, that at York we have four canons residentiary, so-called and paid—*quasi lucus a non lucendo*, because for nine months in every year they do not reside. Nor have they any duty whatever when they do reside, unless they are also prebendaries, that is, non-residentiary canons. The non-residentiaries preach all the sermons and make the majority at almost every chapter. Nowhere, in church or out of it, is there any single duty for a canon-residentiary as such. Formerly there was one sermon yearly between the four; but her present Majesty, with that gracious consideration which she ever manifests for the burdens of the clergy, has abolished that sermon by discontinuing the observance of the 30th of January: and now there is not a single word for a residentiary canon of York to say or sing, except, as I said, in the character of a non-residentiary. My time is out. I can only say that such unprofitable dignities, retained only for the patronage, and held in plurality with other and genuine benefices, are blots on the system, and what remains of the capitular revenues should be applied to the restoration, according to modern exigencies, of Archbishop Thomas's admirable plan of cathedral and diocesan organization.

THE LORD BISHOP OF CARLISLE.

I HAVE asked permission to say a few words for a very definite purpose, and I am afraid that the remarks I make will be very dry. Before I proceed to them I wish to make one observation upon something that fell from my friend Mr. Powell, who has gone out of the room, and I shall have therefore to hit him in his absence. [A VOICE: "Mr. Powell is here."] I am very glad to hear it. He quoted some words as spoken by a certain Dean at Norwich, and from the manner in which he made the quotation I rather take it for granted that he referred to the then Dean of Ely. If I am wrong he will speak. [MR. POWELL: "Quite right."] He quoted the words of the then Dean of Ely in this form—that "Cathedrals do not march." Now that gives the impression to this audience that the then Dean of Ely expressed the view that the cathedrals were not progressive bodies and did not keep up with the times. Whether that be so or not I will not say; but what I uttered at Norwich had quite a different bearing. I said I was sorry that having such a grand cathedral as Ely with a small population round it, I was not able to do with that small population what I should be able to do if it were in the midst of a large population. And I said,—“Unhappily we cannot move our cathedrals about, so as to follow the population.” It was in that sense I said that cathedrals did not march. But although I did not use the word “march” I did say that whilst populations increased, and moved here and there, cathedrals were not movable. I will now speak a few words concerning a step which I regard as desirable in the way of legislation. My friend, Mr. Beresford Hope, has spoken of a certain Act which he was mainly instrumental in carrying through Parliament a few years ago—a very useful Act, for which I beg to tender him my thanks; but I am afraid that I shall have to trouble him with a little more legislation notwithstanding; and if, when a certain Bill comes into the House of Commons, he will give it his powerful support, I shall be very much obliged to him. Reference has been made to the old and the new foundations—phraseology which is perfectly familiar to myself, probably to everybody on the platform, and to a considerable number in the room. Some, however, may not be quite so familiar with the phraseology, and I will therefore just refer to the great distinction between the old and the new foundations. The old foundations, which were the cathedrals before the time of the Reformation, exist in a condition with respect to statutes, I think, of this kind—that they can make their own statutes, when they require them, with the assent of the Visitor. The new foundations, which took their rise in the time of King Henry the Eighth, and which were monastic institutions converted into cathedral institutions, have no such power. They have a body of statutes which were given to them originally by King Henry VIII., and in some cases, as in that of the Cathedral of Carlisle, they possess the original body of statutes to the present day. In some instances the statutes have been changed. In my previous cathedral—that of Ely—it was so. During the civil war the original Henry VIII.’s statutes were lost. It was impossible to ascertain what was the original form of those statutes, and, consequently, King Charles II. at his restoration gave the cathedral a new body of statutes. But whether they be Henry VIII.’s or Charles II.’s statutes or any others—and there may possibly be others—the new cathedrals have a body of statutes such as do not belong to those of the old foundations. The dean and chapter are bound to carry out these statutes, and the bishops are appointed as visitors to see that they are carried out. A code of statutes formed in the reign of Henry VIII. is exceedingly unlikely to be a code applicable to the present day. My own code of statutes at Carlisle bristles with

difficulties. I will not go into them, but I will mention as an illustration—I do not say that this is a practical difficulty, but I give it as a point which will illustrate the character of these statutes and the desirableness of having them changed—that the Dean of Carlisle, the very rev. and respected Dr. Close, is bound, by the statutes of his cathedral, to pray for the soul of Henry VIII. You will thus see, I think, that the statutes are in a condition requiring revision. Now I have had a great difficulty in my mind as to how to take this matter in hand. I had at one time got a clause introduced into a Bill before Parliament, which was referred to by the Dean of Chester, but which, owing to a political crisis and a change of ministry, had to be dropped; and I do not know what its fate might have been. But some time ago I found an Act of Parliament, the existence of which I did not know before, and it appears from that, that in the sixth year of the reign of Queen Anne, an Act was passed concerning divers cathedrals and collegiate churches; and this statute of Queen Anne's deals exactly with the difficulty which has existed down to the present day. It appears that there was a great doubt as to what were the real statutes in these new foundations. There was a doubt whether these statutes, which were in existence in the different cathedrals, had really legal power, and they required even then to be modified. Accordingly an Act of Parliament was passed in the sixth year of the reign of Queen Anne, giving to the Queen certain powers, establishing the existing statutes as legal, and giving her the power to amend those statutes. I believe that Queen Anne never used the power given to her. Acting upon a suggestion in this useful Act of Queen Anne, I have ventured to draft a Bill which I propose, if well supported, to introduce into Parliament. It is a Bill simply for the purpose of giving to her present Majesty and her successors power, under certain forms, to alter the cathedral statutes, and to adapt them to existing conditions. Now I venture to think that the line I have taken is a very constitutional and useful one. I take this Act of Queen Anne, and I propose to enact that Her present Majesty shall have the same powers which were granted to Queen Anne years ago. I cannot conceive that any House of Parliament could resist such a reasonable proposition. I have consulted several leading statesmen and I have received encouragement from them; and from the bishops and the deans I have received as much support as I could expect. What I propose to do with the Bill is this—in the first place I wish to lay it before you and so to publish it and invite opinion upon it; and, if I get sufficient support, I propose to bring a Bill before Parliament; and when I do so I trust that I shall have support both in the Upper House and also in the Lower. I do not expect, and I do not intend to try, to pass it into law this session. What I think would be desirable—I am speaking my own view, which must be modified according to circumstances; but what I think would be most desirable is this: to introduce the Bill into the House of Lords; to ask their lordships to give it a second reading upon the understanding that it should go to a select committee, because a number of details are necessarily involved, concerning which I am not at all bigoted, and which can, perhaps, be most conveniently discussed in a select committee of the House of Lords. I only wish to put forward a general scheme; and I have no doubt the wisdom of a select committee will be put into a workable shape.

The following is the draft-bill, presented by the Bishop of Carlisle:—

“An Act to amend an Act passed in the 6th year of Queen Anne, and entitled ‘An Act for the avoiding of doubts and questions touching the statutes of divers Cathedral and Collegiate Churches.’

“Whereas an Act was passed in the sixth year of Queen Anne, whereby certain doubts and questions concerning the validity of the Statutes of the Cathedral and Collegiate Churches founded by King Henry the Eighth were

cleared and settled, and it was enacted that such Statutes as had been usually received and practised in the government of the same respectively since the restoration of King Charles the Second should be taken and adjudged to be valid in law :

“ And whereas it was provided in the said Act that it should be lawful for Her Majesty, during her life, from time to time to alter, amend, correct, revoke, diminish, or enlarge the said Statutes, or any of them, or to make new Statutes and Ordinances for the said Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, and for resuming or settling the local visitation of them, or any of them, in such manner, from time to time, as to Her Majesty should seem fit :

“ And whereas it is expedient that similar power should be given to Her Majesty Queen Victoria (whom may God preserve), and to her successors :

“ Be it therefore enacted by the Queen’s most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and the Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows :

“ 1. This Act may be cited as the ‘ Cathedral Statutes Act, 1879.’

“ 2. It shall be lawful for the Dean and Chapter of any one of the Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, founded by King Henry the Eighth, to prepare the draft of a revised body of Statutes, which shall in their opinion be suitable to the present wants of the said Cathedral or Collegiate Church, but shall be in no manner repugnant to, or inconsistent with, the constitution of the Church of England as the same is now by law established, or the laws of the land.

“ 3. The said draft body of Statutes shall be laid before the Visitor for his approval.

“ 4. The draft body of Statutes, as approved by the Visitor, shall be submitted to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England, and if approved by them, or when modified by them and subsequently accepted by the Dean and Chapter and the Visitor as so modified, shall be submitted to Her Majesty in Council; and if approved by Her Majesty shall be published in the *London Gazette*.

“ 5. The body of Statutes so published in the *London Gazette* shall be deemed to be and shall be, from and after the date of publication, the Statutes by which the Cathedral or Collegiate Church in question shall be governed.

“ 6. Any new body of Statutes promulgated under the authority of this Act shall contain Statutes regulating the following matters amongst others :

The rights and duties of the Dean, Canons, and other statutable members of the Foundation.

The rights and duties of the Bishop with respect to his Cathedral Church and Chapter.

The rights and duties of the Honorary Canons.

“ 7. It shall be lawful for Her Majesty after the publication of a new body of Statutes to change or annul any Statute or Ordinance, or to make any additional Statute or Ordinance, from time to time, in the manner defined by this Act.”

The Very Rev. W. R. FREMANTLE, D.D., Dean of Ripon.

I FEEL that this discussion should not close without having a few words of a practical nature from a lately appointed dean whose experience in the work of a cathedral may help to illustrate some of the statements which have been made by the previous speakers. Not many years ago those who wrote upon church reform spoke of the cathedral in very disparaging terms; and I confess that I was disposed at that time to sympathise with them, thinking that cathedrals were not of much use as regards the practical work of evangelisation in the country. And I remember

reading one objection which seemed to me at the time to have considerable force, and that was the appointment of eminent men to deaneries and canonries and placing them in positions where their powers would be lost to the Church, and the comparison was made of putting an elephant to draw a perambulator. But humble as my antecedents have been I have not found that to be the case in my experience. I can only say that I have not found myself in the position of having to draw a little vehicle; but on the contrary my powers have been tested to the uttermost to keep in motion one of the most useful pieces of machinery that the Church of England possesses. My experience leads me to this conclusion; because I feel that the cathedral church occupies the same relation to the diocese that the parish church does to the parish; and if properly employed I am quite certain that, by God's blessing, it may be made productive of the greatest possible good results to the Church of England. I feel in this respect that there is a little difference in my own view of the cathedral to that which has been stated by the Dean of Chester to-day. He said that several parish churches possessed the same advantages which cathedrals possess. Looking at it from my point of view, I do not know the parish church would possess the same advantage which a cathedral does. It is true that some of them are very beautiful, and very spacious, and very well appointed; but still when I look at the position of our cathedrals, locally and ecclesiastically, I see that they have advantages which no parish churches really possess. Take for example their size, and grandeur, and adaptation for great functions: they have or ought to have the very best choirs, the best organs, the best libraries; they have all these appendages and appliances which are needful for the use of a diocese; and if they were only duly valued and appreciated we should find them, as they ought to be, the centres of life throughout the whole of the diocese. Look at the pleasure with which our honorary canons and our clergy come from time to time to spend a few days in the cathedral city: how much they delight in hearing and attending the beautiful services as they are now performed in the cathedrals; for I hope and trust that we are approaching to a higher standard of devotion than there was in times past. Instead of going to look at the architecture and antiquities, and to hear the anthem and regard the choir—men and boys as mere musical performers, now you see, I hope, in all cathedrals as you will find at Ripon, that the boys and the men are reverent and devotional in the performance of the services, and that they are not professional men paid to go through their work, but Christian men who feel what they say and sing, and impart to the congregation a sort of sympathy which is truly edifying. It was my happiness a few Sundays ago to see at the early communion service at eight in the morning three choir men and one choir boy attending the service. And therefore, instead of looking at our cathedrals as being theatres for the dispensing of a gorgeous ceremonial and the eloquence of Church dignitaries and the best rendering of sacred music, you will find in them I trust an increasingly high standard of devotion, and where you will see a congregation, not coming in crowds as visitors to walk about and look at the different points of architecture and the painted windows and monuments which are presented to their view; they now come and sit down in their places and ask for the Prayer-book and join in the service. And then with regard to the opportunities which the cathedral affords for great occasions, such as choral festivals and diocesan gatherings for charitable and missionary work. Few churches can accommodate the attendants upon special occasions of their own parishioners; but the cathedral can provide for the diocese. A few months ago a commanding officer came to me and asked if I could provide for a parade service for the North Yorkshire Volunteers on Whit-Sunday. I did not know whether I could manage it or not, for when he informed me there were 800 men to be seated, in addition to our ordinary large morning congregation I doubted as to the possibility

of making the arrangements. But when I came to consult the vergers, I found that by the addition of a few seats and chairs we were more than equal to the emergency, for that we could not only receive these 800 volunteers, but the whole body of the Town Council, the young women from the training schools, our usual congregation, and a large number of visitors. The grand old nave of the cathedral was crammed full of people, and yet in the transepts and choir we had space for many more. It was an imposing service. We had our new organ—one of the finest instruments in England—we had a volunteer choir of thirty or forty men and boys, and we had a sight which made one's very soul thrill with delight as we saw and heard the great congregation uniting in the worship of our Church in the old minster. One word with reference to the work of revival in our cathedral services. This is not only meeting the sympathies of Church people, but it is meeting the sympathies of the Nonconformists also. I have been pleased to see how many Nonconformists come to the cathedral who probably would not come to the parish church. They come to join in our services and our prayers with great delight. A few Sundays ago the President of the Wesleyan Conference was present at a large choral festival in the nave, when we had a special choral service and 200 voices in the choir. He said, to a clergyman who was present, he should like, if it were not an intrusion, that a message be given to the dean to say how much delight he took in the service, and he begged to thank the dean for the sermon. This feeling shows that we are breaking down the barriers and prejudices, and we may rejoice to welcome Nonconformists whenever they will come and join with us in our cathedral worship, where a few years ago they would have thought that had they done so the very stones of the roof would have fallen upon them. Now, thank God, the Holy Spirit seems to be filling our services with life and power; and instead of having to deal with antagonism, we have much sympathy with us: and I hope that that feeling will go on increasing more and more.

REV. PROFESSOR RAWLINSON, Canterbury.

As a member of a cathedral body which holds, I may say, in ecclesiastical order, the first place among such bodies in this kingdom, I wish to return, first of all, my thanks—and I think I may speak on behalf of cathedral bodies generally—to the readers and speakers on this occasion for the kind advice they have given to the cathedral bodies. When I first became a member of a cathedral body, I regarded it as my duty first of all to endeavour to make up my mind as to what were the primary uses of cathedrals, and how the existing cathedrals, with the bodies attached to them, might be improved. I read numerous works on that subject, among them a volume of collected essays on cathedrals, and it struck me that whilst the various uses which were pointed out for cathedral bodies were each and all of them extremely good uses, there were others, also, not pointed out, which were equally desirable, and which you would very much like to have. Yet if a body of some four or five, or, as in my own case, seven persons, were to undertake all these manifold duties, they would require to be endowed with a strength and a ubiquity almost superhuman. I have heard suggestions and recommendations to-day not nearly so wide as are recommended in that volume whereof I spoke, and in others which it called forth; but still I have heard recommended a very wide sphere of duty in the diocese in matters not immediately connected with the cathedral itself. Now my experience is against that. We have first of all to consider what is the great object of the cathedral, and then to see whether the body of persons whom the nation has agreed to attach to it, and who receive a certain stipend in connection with it—whether those persons could do more than

properly accomplish the primary objects of the cathedrals; and whether the performance of the various other suggested duties would not prevent them from the performance of their real and main duties. The cathedrals are primarily and mainly intended to be places of worship—places for the daily worship of Almighty God, at least twice a day, with all the accessories which raise that worship to the highest level. They are, as has been well said, intended to be the pattern churches of the diocese. It is for each cathedral to endeavour to make itself—in its worship, in its officers, in its choristers, in its vestments, in its processions, in all that it does—a pattern to the whole of the diocese. It seemed to me that that was generally allowed here, in this room, and I suppose it would be generally allowed by the Church Congress; but I am not at all sure that everybody sees the whole bearings of the admission. What is the ideal of a cathedral? It is this—twice a day should enter into that house of God, to the solemn strains of music, a long procession of persons robed in white dresses—the garb of purity—choir boys, like boy angels, walking first; then the singing men, who should be staid and reverent; and then the priests of God, trained like Asaph in the musical worship of God; and then persons of great learning or high intellectual power, such as the canons should be; and last of all some one still more eminent and learned, holding the office of dean. Thus they should enter on each occasion, to solemn strains of music, walking with reverent gesture up the long aisle, and kneeling with reverence at the prayers, and singing the canticles and psalms, and hymns and versicles, one after another, till the service ends. Consider, also, when you come on the Sunday—or at least once a week—to the highest act of worship in our religion, you should see the dean as he goes up to the altar, dressed according to the law, in a sacrificial garment; and this, remember, is the pattern up to which all parish churches should work. The cope is obligatory in the cathedrals, but at present not allowed in the parish church. A change in this law, or exposition of the law, is one of the consequences which would follow from the cathedral being the pattern church. One thing more I would wish to urge. The most essential thing in a cathedral is a thoroughly good dean. You who are not members of cathedral bodies cannot know how much the whole initiative, the whole power of real government, is given to the dean. Public opinion is not yet alive to the importance of deans being practical men—men who can manage and administer, and not mere men of learning. I hope you will, all of you, help to enlighten public opinion, until it comes to be a generally accepted truth, that deans ought to be appointed for their business powers, and not for mere learning.

The Venerable Archdeacon ILES, Lichfield.

WE have heard a great deal of what a cathedral should do. I venture to tell you what a cathedral, of which I am a canon, is doing; and to show you what Bishop Selwyn in connection with Lichfield cathedral has done. We have a body of old foundation prebendaries, and they were called forth by Bishop Selwyn into active work. In olden times they merely once or twice a year preached a morning sermon. Bishop Selwyn revived the great chapter and also gave it large and active work. One of the first things done was to carefully revise the statutes belonging to the cathedral. We are now, so far as the cathedral and the statutes are concerned, entirely in harmony with the spirit of the age. He wished the chapter to be a kind of council of the diocese, and we were to be always endeavouring to carry out some diocesan work or other. It has been said with respect to patronage, that exhausted men should not be preferred to the stalls; and that those who are

preferred to the stalls should not be allowed to lie on the shelf. As to Bishop Selwyn no man who was preferred by him was ever allowed to be on the shelf. He introduced men who had worked hard in the towns, and others who found that they had leisure in their country cures to give to diocesan work; and he brought them together with signal advantage to his diocese. He was most anxious to revive two suspended canonries, and even up to the day of his death he was making attempts to do so. But Mr. Beresford Hope's Act, although very excellent, is not so easy to carry out in all cases. A canonry became vacant, and he wished to divide it into three parts; and instead of giving the £500 to one canon he desired that it should be divided among three persons, each one of whom should be resident a month in the year. But the ecclesiastical commissioners would not allow this, and he died before he was able to carry out his plan of reviving the suspended canonries. Canonries should be residentiary, it has been said. We have in Lichfield four canons, three of them are resident all the twelve months of the year, and the fourth—who stands before you—is non-resident simply because Bishop Selwyn placed me in a small living close to Lichfield; but in a short time I shall also probably be found living all the time at Lichfield, instead of as now a few miles from it. As a body at Lichfield we residentiaries find plenty to do. The sphere of work marked out by Canon Gregory is not the least bit too large; and at present we are doing a very considerable part of it. We possess most of the diocesan institutions which have been mentioned, and the cathedral body take a prominent part in working them. We have one canon who takes the Theological College under his close care and constant attention; another devotes himself to educational work; the third was Coadjutor-Bishop to Bishop Selwyn; and the fourth canon is an archdeacon; all are closely connected with important diocesan work, and Lichfield is fast becoming the very heart of the diocese. A poor benefice fund has sprung from one of our cathedral bodies; and in twelve years my predecessor added at least £70,000 to the endowments of the poor benefices in one archdeaconry only. Men desirous of taking holy orders come to us twice a year for examination, while continuing to work under some clergyman and to carry on their business; and so they are prepared to become in time students of the Theological College. And then we have our great choral and missionary festivals, in which are sometimes gathered together 1700 or 1800 singers. From 3000 to 5000 people assemble in the cathedral on such occasions. And last but not least we have, with the view of promoting the religious life of the parishes, a parochial missionary society, in which are banded together missionaries, and men desirous to be trained as such, who shall go forth and conduct missions in our several parishes. Here is a cathedral fully and actively at work, and where residentiary and non-residentiary canons are ready to take up anything which the diocese demands of them or which can be shown to be fairly in their reach. In all this we owe very much to Bishop Selwyn's active spirit, and I hope that very soon a college in memory of Bishop Selwyn will be founded in Cambridge, and that it will be productive of other men, who shall go forth to their work with a portion, at any rate, of his mantle upon their shoulders.

Rev. Canon WOODHOUSE, Manchester.

I STAND forth for a few moments only by your permission, my lord, rather as a duty than as a pleasure, because, agreeing as I do, with the great principles which Canon Gregory has so earnestly announced, I feel that the real duty of any canon called to work in this great system is to give information rather than to discuss now the great principles with which one cannot but agree. As the junior member

of a very central chapter called by your lordship to work—I hope with some measure of energy—I feel that something ought to be said, if only for a few moments, on the working of our system at Manchester. We have the honour, and I think we may partly call it the happiness, of being under a special Act of Parliament, and it seems to ensure in its action the great features which the Dean of Chester sketched as desirable, and which Canon Gregory sketched as being practical, and the Bishop of Iowa sketched as being the desideratum in America. We are compelled to reside in Manchester—the canons who are appointed to take part in the action of our cathedral are compelled to accept Manchester livings in the gift of the dean and canons, and therefore they are by compulsion resident in Manchester. We have, therefore, in this respect the elements wherewith to work out the cathedral system. No one who knows Manchester can feel that she has been idle in attempting to work out the problem. Our congregations in our cathedral are congregations which stir the preacher as, I think, they stir one another. We are grafted on to an old parochial system. The church before it became a cathedral was collegiate and parochial, and we therefore had the advantage of congregations assembling in our cathedral—one of the widest in the land, perhaps the widest although not the longest—but constituting a very delightful area on which to administer the everlasting truth. But we feel that we have *also* to work out our *cathedral* system as far as it can be done, consistently with the powers of mind and of body. I think, under our loved dean, and the part the canons are compelled by law to take in the administration of the cathedral, that those who attend the services will feel there is a tone of reverence in the worship and of suitability in our music. Sometimes our bishop thinks the latter too elaborate and grand, but I hope that at other times he forgives us, because we feel that we are in some sense a centre of ecclesiastical music. And admitting as you do, by the acquiescence of this meeting, that the cathedrals have been the instrument, under the providence of God, of keeping through long years, services in dignity and beauty and grandeur, which are acting upon the churches—the parochial churches—I feel that there does lay upon us a responsibility; and I can only say that I am grateful that my bishop has drawn me into an attempt, if God give me strength, to work together with those who work with me, to perfect the great scheme of uniting the cathedral, on the one hand, with the diocese, and on the other with the parochial system, in which one is compelled to take a happy interest.

THE CHAIRMAN.

I AM not aware that there is any other speaker who desires to address the meeting. I desire to express the pleasure I have felt in being here this morning. I had taken my place in the other hall, and was prepared for listening with eager interest to the discussion which was to go forward there, and I thought the lines had fallen rather hardly upon me when I received a direction, which I considered equivalent to a command, to come to this hall and preside over this section of the Congress. But I will now frankly own that the ability and the interest which have characterised the whole of our proceedings this morning have amply compensated me for any disappointment which I might for a moment have felt at not being elsewhere.

THURSDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 3rd, 1878.

The Right Rev. Bishop RYAN took the Chair at 7 P.M.

SUNDAY SCHOOLS AND KINDRED AGENCIES: THEIR SPECIAL IMPORTANCE IN THE PRESENT DAY.

The CHAIRMAN.

BEFORE I call upon the first reader of a paper I just wish to mention one fact which may suggest something practical to some of our brethren here present. I find that already there are a great many cards sent up from those who wish to address the meeting; and the fact is this, that at the Congress in Leeds, in 1872, I had to preside at the meeting of this kind, and I had 22 more cards than I could dispose of, which showed the immense interest taken in education. That led us to establish at Bradford a conference, which has become an annual one; and I am only speaking from the experience of Sunday-school teachers, that it has become one of the most useful and practical organisations in reference to Sunday-schools. I mention this for the benefit of some of my brethren, and perhaps it may elicit some remarks on the question whether it is practicable to adopt the same kind of thing in other places in support of the work they have met to consider.

PAPERS.

Rev. T. A. STOWELL, M.A., Rector of Christ Church and Rural Dean, Salford.

My paper will treat only of "Sunday-schools."

In order duly to realise the importance of the subject which claims the attention of this Congress to-night, we must bear in mind four considerations (which, although they be truisms, demand constant recognition).

1. That the scholars in our schools will, in a few quick-passing years, be our citizens—the strength or weakness of the community—in whose hands, under God, the future of this England of ours will be largely held.

2. That they will be the fathers and mothers of a generation to come, and influence for good or evil children yet unborn.

3. That the influences brought to bear upon them during this period will, to a great extent, determine their whole future.

4. That with these is the *Church's great*, and it may be only, *opportunity*. This consideration cannot be too deeply impressed upon our minds. The children now flock in crowds to our Sunday-schools. Their parents gladly entrust them to our care. We may freely teach them what we like, and make of them what we can.

The figures which are sometimes adduced to prove the failure of Sunday-schools, as to the number of the inmates of our gaols who

have been Sunday scholars, are (whatever may be their value from another point of view) chiefly instructive as proving that, with very few exceptions, the whole of the lower classes, even those from which our criminal population is recruited, do come, for a longer or shorter period, under the influence of the Sunday-school. They may well serve to bring home to us the vastness of the *opportunity* thus afforded to us, and of the greatness of the *responsibility* thus entailed upon us. Are we sufficiently alive to that responsibility? Are we making the most of that opportunity?

We are sorely perplexed as to the means whereby we may get hold of the working-classes. We try various plans. Their comparative failure saddens and disheartens us. We are tempted to despair. I believe that our Sunday-schools are almost the only available—certainly are the most hopeful—agency to which we can look to remedy the existing state of things. If we may not hope to win back, to any great extent, a generation which has become hardened into indifference and godlessness, why may we not look through our Sunday-schools and kindred agencies to gain and retain such a hold upon the rising generation as may not be lost in after life? Why may we not hope that in the years that are to come, the reproach of the irreligion of the lower orders of society may be rolled away, and the Church of Christ may not have still before her the almost hopeless task of reclaiming the masses of the people who are now missing from her fold?

At all events we have a grand opportunity, which we are bound to improve to the utmost of our power. I cannot help thinking that, notwithstanding the recently awakened interest in the subject, there are few amongst us who adequately estimate the importance of the Church's work in her Sunday-schools, or the immense power which she might exercise by means of this agency. These considerations are largely applicable also to the work of the Church in her day-schools. We are, wisely I think, confining our attention to-night to the Sunday-school. I feel however bound, in the outset, to state my firm conviction that the Sunday-school, great as is its value, can *never be a substitute* for distinctive religious teaching in our day-schools. It can at best be only a supplement to, and continuation of, such teaching. (I have had frequent opportunities of proving the marked difference between two scholars of equal intelligence, who have been taught in the same Sunday-school, but one of whom, on the week-day, has attended a merely secular school, while the other has attended a school in which distinctive religious instruction is given.)

There are many important aspects of the work of the Sunday-school, in addition to its primary object,—the imparting religious instruction to the young, and exercising a friendly care over them. The gathering together of the scholars to lead them to public worship is, in itself, an important function, for, much as we may desire to see parents themselves conducting their children to church, it is certain that, in the great majority of cases, there would, but for the Sunday-school, be none to say to such:—"Let us go into the house of the Lord." The Sunday-school is valuable as affording a most useful

and self-improving field of labour for Christian workers, and one in which they may be trained for higher ministries. It is a means of promoting friendly intercourse—so much needed in these days—between the different classes of society. And it might serve as an admirable basis for voluntary parochial mission work, if each teacher were to make it his aim to bring the influence which his connection with his scholars gives him to bear upon the inmates of their homes generally. (Some ten or twelve houses would thus be his particular charge; while his indirect influence would naturally extend to even a wider circle.)

The title of this evening's subject invites our attention to the *special importance* of Sunday-schools *in the present day*; and it may safely be affirmed that there never was a time when their work assumed a greater importance or gave promise of more enlarged usefulness. The general spread of elementary education among the lower classes, and the elevation of the quality of our day-schools, with the consequent increase of intellectual capacity among those who attend our Sunday-schools; the restriction placed upon the opportunities of imparting religious instruction on the week-day; and the rapid extensions of the School Board system, especially in the Metropolis, which postulates the Sunday-school as its most needful complement (seeing that, by its means alone, any doctrinal teaching, not to say real religious instruction, can be secured); the intellectual activity which largely characterises our young men; the wide circulation of immoral and sceptical popular literature; and the political power with which the working-classes have been recently entrusted; all these considerations tend to enhance the importance in the present day of Sunday-schools and other kindred agencies, for obtaining and retaining a hold upon the young. Nor must it be forgotten that, under the existing state of things, the Sunday-school is virtually the only agency by which we can impart distinctive Church teaching to the young. The Archbishop of Canterbury has said that the battle of the Church of England was to be fought in the Sunday-school. And surely her Sunday-schools ought to be the nurseries of our Church, training up for her loyal and attached, because intelligent, children. It is notorious that the Non-conformists have largely used this agency to attach the scholars to their own particular denomination, and to make them Dissenters upon principle (not scrupling even to inculcate in them hostility to the Church). We, on the other hand, have generally made too little use of our opportunity; and it is owing to this that so many of our former scholars have been easily led in after life to exchange the church for the chapel; and that of those who remain in our communion, so few can be said to be intelligent Church-people, who can give a reason for their churchmanship, or defend against shallow and fallacious objections the constitution, doctrine, and formularies of the Church to which they belong.

Surely we should endeavour to teach our scholars to know why they are Church-folk and not Dissenters. We should help them to understand and to be able to vindicate the constitution and teaching of their Church; we should warn and fortify them against the

specious arguments and seductive attractions of Romanism on the one hand, and the strong enticements of "Disbelief" on the other; we should train them up to be loyal to the great principles of the Reformation. (In the higher classes we should not neglect the study of the Thirty-nine Articles and Nowell's Catechism, while such books as Bishop Titcomb's "*Gladius Ecclesiæ*" and Row's "*Why am I a Christian?*" will be found valuable.) Then might we look to see raised up to our Church from her Sunday-schools a goodly succession of sons and daughters, not only firm in their attachment to her, but also able and valiant to defend her in the day of battle. And truly may we say, "Happy is that Church which has her quiver full of such arrows: she shall not be ashamed, for these shall speak with (margin, subdue) her enemies in the gate."

It may indeed be suggested to one who takes so sanguine a view of the possibilities of the Sunday-school system, that we have long enjoyed these opportunities, and that the result has not been commensurate either with the efforts put forth or the expectations which might reasonably be entertained. And, although I believe that Sunday-schools have been a means of incalculable service to our Church and blessing to our country, and that we can scarcely realise what would have been the spiritual and moral condition of the masses of our population if their beneficent influence had been wanting, and although I think that in some cases unreasonable expectations have been entertained, I am free to confess that, *comparatively speaking*, they have failed. The irreligious lives of the majority of the working-classes, most of whom, it may safely be affirmed, have been Sunday scholars, afford a sufficient proof of this.

This comparative failure has however been, I believe, not the fault of the system but of its working. Our opportunities have in time past been, to a great extent, thrown away. We have not made enough of our Sunday-schools. Undoubtedly, so far as the Church of England is concerned, the Sunday-school has been the weak point of our parochial system.

The Sunday-school, until recently, can scarcely be said to have been recognised by our Church as part of the parochial system. In former days she was too respectable for such irregular agency. The clergy too, often looked coldly or suspiciously, or even with jealousy, upon it, and the result was that in many cases the Sunday-school became a little independent republic in the parish. Left without any recognised head, it was carried on without any recognised system. And thus it has come to pass that sufficient attention has not been paid to the organisation and efficiency of our schools, because sufficient importance has not been attached or recognition extended to them, and no legitimately-constituted authority has been exercised over them. Their quality has not been elevated so as to keep pace with the elevation of the day-school, or the requirements of the times.

Happily, this state of things is fast passing away. The work of the Sunday-school is receiving due recognition on all hands. It finds a prominent place in bishops' charges, the discussions of our

diocesan conferences, and the efforts of our diocesan boards of education. We have examinations of teachers and scholars, and inspection of the schools; associations of teachers for mutual help and counsel are being formed in every direction; while an abundant, varied, and admirable literature for the assistance of the teachers is constantly issuing from the press.

It is only fair to say that the greatest credit is due to the Church of England Sunday-school Institute, alike for awakening attention to the subject, and for stimulating and equipping well-directed effort.

To come to the practical point. What are the needs of the Sunday-school of the future which is to realise the high ideal which has been suggested? In offering a few suggestions, I hope I may be pardoned if I fall back, to a great extent, upon my own tolerably large experience of Sunday-schools in Lancashire and Yorkshire.

It may interest some of my hearers to form some acquaintance with the extent and character of my present field of observation; and it will enable them the better to understand the standpoint from which I regard the Sunday-school,—doubtless under conditions very different from those of many here present, especially those coming from the southern counties.

In my own parish in Salford, containing a population of about 12,000, chiefly of the poorer classes, we have in three schools upwards of 2,100 scholars on the books (the number on the books of the day-school being 1,638); 329 of these attend a Ragged Sunday-school held in the evening. Of the 1,778 attending the ordinary schools, 457 are in the separate infants' departments, and under 8 years of age; 795 are between the ages of 8 and 15 years; 339 between the ages of 15 and 21 years, and 223 above the age of 21 years:—altogether 562 above 15 years of age. Of these 198 are communicants. At the last biennial Confirmation 93 candidates were presented from the schools. From £70 to £90 a year is raised by the scholars for missionary work. Of 9 superintendents and 132 teachers, more than half have been formerly scholars in the school.

I think we want—I. *More direct recognition of our Sunday-schools* as a part of the Church's system, and of their superintendents and teachers as worthy of honour for their work's sake. I am not so wedded to the principle, "let nothing be done without the bishop," that I would advocate, with some, the formal admission of teachers to their office by the bishop. The teachers are the representatives and officers of the parochial clergyman, and are responsible to him alone. He must therefore not merely claim and maintain his proper place in the administration of the school, and in the selection or approval and appointment of the superintendents and the teachers, but he must also duly and diligently fulfil the responsibilities which his position entails upon him. He must be no stranger in his Sunday-school, and his interest in it must be manifest. Our congregations too must be taught to recognise the workers in the Sunday-school as their representatives in the discharge of a responsibility which rests in common upon them all. Beyond this I venture to

suggest as acts of recognition of our Sunday-schools, that they should have assigned to them a prominent place in the programmes of our diocesan boards of education; that diocesan or ruri-decanal examinations and inspection of Sunday-schools be instituted; and that our bishops should lend their sanction to the work, not only by presiding at distributions of prizes and certificates, but also by an occasional visit to the schools, and a few words of encouragement to the teachers, when they have been preaching in a parish.

II. *More attention should be given to making our Sunday-schools attractive and bright.* This is most important, with a view to the retaining of our scholars after they have become their own masters.

The *place* should be attractive and bright. We church people who have sacrificed so much for and to our day-schools, labour commonly under the disadvantage of having to use the same room for both day and Sunday-school, while the convenience of the latter has to give way to the requirements of the former. The Nonconformists, on the other hand, generally have buildings specially designed to meet the requirements of the Sunday-school. In America the art of making the Sunday-school attractive, not to say luxurious, is thoroughly understood. I venture, however, to suggest that we may do more than is generally now done to render the buildings which we possess convenient for Sunday-school purposes, and that where new schools are built (as they may now be without the vexatious restrictions formerly imposed) the requirements of the Sunday-school be not lost sight of. It is most desirable that comfortable and well-arranged class-rooms, furnished with tables and chairs or backed seats, be provided for the elder scholars, and suitable rooms, with galleries, for the simultaneous instruction of the youngest.

Much may be done to make our rooms more attractive by adorning them with suitable pictures and illuminated texts, or even with plants and flowers.

Again, the whole *method* of conducting our Sunday-schools wants more brightness and variety. We have made them too like our day-schools, only more heavy and dull. The hours have been, in many cases, too long, and the routine too monotonous. The teaching of the younger scholars has not been sufficiently lively and varied (especially where they are taught in a class, each scholar reading in turn, while the others were idly lounging, or spelling out their task beforehand to themselves), while that of the elder scholars has not been sufficiently intelligent and systematic. There has been too little catechising, and too much sermonising; and it is rather too much to expect from the most exemplary scholar that he should listen to two sermons in church and two additional ones in school*

* "I am confident," says the Dean of Carlisle, "that the Sunday-school is just the faggot above the load in many instances. I firmly believe that the subsequent irreligious life of so many who have been through our schools is to be traced to the injudicious amount and quality of the whole Sabbath-day instruction. Sunday, instead of being a day of rest and relaxation, is the heaviest and dullest day of the seven to the poor children."—Evidence, *Report of Commissioners*, 1861.

And this suggests another mistake that has been commonly made. We have been wont to lead the children to long services in church before they were capable of taking any intelligent interest or personal part in them. Too frequently in church they have been cooped up in out-of-the-way and uncomfortable places, where they could see or hear little or nothing. Thus they have very naturally contracted such a distaste for the services of the Church that they have with little compunction turned their backs upon them as soon as they left the school, and too often learned to associate Sunday and everything connected with it in their early days with dullness and weariness.

In order to remedy this the Prayer-book ought to be thoroughly and constantly taught and explained in our schools. We should aim at making the services of the Church interesting by making them intelligible. In my own schools this process begins even with the infants, who are taught to repeat the Canticles and some of the Prayers before they can read them, and are thus familiarised with them from their earliest years. After this the language of the Liturgy should be explained, and gradually the whole plan and spirit of the service unfolded. In this way opportunity will be given in the higher classes to call attention, not only to the doctrines involved in the right understanding of the Prayer-book, but also to those questions as to Church order, government, and discipline which will naturally arise in the minds of those who have been taught not to use in a matter of such solemnity as the worship of God any words to which they cannot attach some meaning.

As auxiliary to this course of instruction, liturgical services should be held in the school for the younger scholars, to train them for the services of the Church. Through these they may be taught to behave reverently, to find their places and to take their parts far more readily than, for obvious reasons, could be the case in church. These services may be conducted by one of the clergy, or by a layman, and should be short, varied, and hearty, with much singing, and a bright and simple catechetical address. In my own parish we have not only services for infants in the several schools, but also one for those above them who are too young to be taken with any advantage to church, held in a central school, to which the scholars from the other schools are brought. From these they may be promoted to attendance at church, where well-situated and comfortable seats should be allotted to them, either for the whole, or at first for

“Most of us know,” says the late Archdeacon Sandford, “how dull, flat, and unprofitable, as generally conducted, this (the Sunday-school) has been. Every man of sense must admit that, if school on the Lord’s day is to be rendered really serviceable to the Church and to attract rather than to repel the working-classes, there must be more of life, and interest, and novelty infused into it; more of sympathy and of companionship, and less of restraint and of task-work.”—*Bampton Lectures*, vi., pp. 153-4.

Mr. Fraser (now Bishop of Manchester) one of the Assistant Commissioners on Education in 1861, observes of the west of England—“I was in the habit of visiting one or more schools every Sunday, but of all I saw—more than twenty—there is not one that has not left the impression of weariness and deadness on my mind.”

a part, of the morning service, leaving quietly during the singing of the hymn before the communion service, or the sermon.

Special services should be frequently held in the church also, in which scholars should sustain the leading parts of the congregation. If such a system of training was duly carried out, it would unquestionably do much to form a hearty and intelligent attachment to our Church and her services, which would not be destroyed by the severance of the leading-strings of school discipline.

The two great needs of our Sunday-schools remain to be noticed. They are—

III. *We want more and better-qualified teachers.* The question of the supply of teachers is one of vital importance, and is in our large towns becoming a more anxious one every day. I am disposed to think that the number of teachers of education and social position is smaller *now*, when they are so much more needed, than it was twenty or thirty years ago—certainly it is relatively to the increase of the population. This is doubtless in part owing to the constant migration of the upper and middle classes from those districts in which the population is densest, and, consequently, the schools are largest. But in part it is, I fear, owing to a lack of self-denying earnestness among the laity, and especially our young men. Every Christian ought to realise a vocation and exercise a ministry for Christ. And what an important and remunerative field for Christian work is the Sunday-school—a field white to harvest, yet to a great extent ungathered because the labourers are too few. One thing is certain—if our Sunday-schools are to prove equal to the demands made upon them in the present day, and to do the great work they may do, we must secure a larger amount of co-operation on the part of our educated and influential lay people.

I would that a voice could go forth from this Congress throughout the land, appealing to such in the name of Christ no longer to suffer this reproach to rest upon them, nor to let the Church's great opportunity be lost because a sufficient supply of duly-qualified workers cannot be found.

I am profoundly convinced of this, that the pressing exigencies of this work (which, let me again repeat it, seems almost the only means to which we can look for christianising the masses of our population) demand a much wider recognition on the part of Church people generally, and of our educated laity in particular, of its claims upon them, and of their duty with respect to it.

Why should not the residents in country districts and suburban parishes spend a part of their Sunday in the school of some poor town parish? Why should we not have a system of solidarity, and the richer districts minister to the spiritual as well as temporal necessities of the poorer? Thus both would be benefited—the workers in finding work to do for which the opportunity was denied to them nearer home, and the work in finding workers not to be met with nearer home.

Surely our bishops and clergy might do much by bringing this matter frequently and prominently before their people. Meantime we must do our utmost to press labourers into this service, and to

train them up for it. Our Sunday-schools themselves ought to afford a constant supply. In the large Sunday-schools connected with St. Paul's, Manchester, with 1,865 scholars on the books, I am informed by Mr. George Milner that there are not more than two or three of 163 teachers who have not been formerly scholars. In my own more than half of the teachers have been scholars in the school. I have found confirmations a valuable recruiting time. We may make use of the services of our day-school teachers, and senior pupil-teachers, though this work should be entirely voluntary on their part. In my own parish we never require such services from our paid teachers, though we gladly welcome them if offered, and, as a general rule, employ them in a different school from that in which they are engaged on the week-day.

While I would not for one moment be supposed to undervalue the services of our existing noble army of teachers—most of whom are, I believe, earnest and devoted workers—I think we ought to endeavour, by every means in our power, to impress them with a higher estimate of the importance, responsibility, and requirements of their work; we must seek to lead them to aim at a higher standard of efficiency, and we must afford them every opportunity for attaining to it. With a view to this, the formation of Sunday-school teachers' associations, with lectures and discussions on subjects specially connected with their work, and the opportunities of attending model lessons to instruct them in the art of teaching—and, still more, the establishment of classes (where practicable, conducted by the clergy) to assist them in their preparation, will be found most valuable. I doubt whether a clergyman can find more important or more remunerative occupation for his time than teaching his Sunday-school teachers.

Two things are, however, I may remark, essential to the successful conduct of such classes—teachers willing and anxious to learn, and an instructor able to teach them. The latter will generally secure the former. No pains should be spared to render these classes attractive and really helpful.

Before I pass from the teachers, let me say that I believe that the real solution of the most important and much-discussed problem, "How to retain our elder scholars?" is to be found in the simple recipe—Provide for them separate and convenient class-rooms, and *capable* teachers. The teacher of an adult class should be superior to his scholars in intelligence, in information, in piety, and, if possible, in social position. In my own parish we have a class of 100 intelligent men (whose average age is 36 years), taught in a large class-room, by one of my curates. In Blackburn, a class of 160 or 170 men (whose average age is 40 years) has for some time been successfully conducted by a lady.

I attach great importance, also, to securing the services of efficient teachers for the infant department, which should always have a separate room. In this, one such teacher, aided by two or three helpers, to keep order can easily instruct 100 children collectively, on a gallery. This department is the foundation upon which the whole superstructure of the school is built, and largely determines its character.

This may suggest a way of economising the efficient teaching power which we possess, by forming large classes, which shall be taught collectively by one principal teacher, while the general care of the scholars composing them might be distributed between two or three or more assistants of inferior intellectual capacity and teaching power. For this purpose, again, separate rooms are needed.

IV. The other great fault in our Sunday-schools has been a want of *systematic teaching*.

Owing to the old prevalent practice of each teacher selecting any portion of Scripture for his lesson, frequently the most unsuitable, and of the too general neglect of the Church Catechism and Prayer Book, it has been, I fear, only too common for a scholar to have passed through a long course of Sunday-school teaching, and yet to have a very desultory and imperfect acquaintance with the great truths revealed in the Bible, and to be in entire ignorance of much of the distinctive teaching of the Church to which he professes to belong.

Our great aim should surely be to secure that no one can have attended a Sunday-school, say for ten or more years, without having had the opportunity, at least, of receiving instruction in some complete system of doctrine and duty, such as is provided in the Church Catechism, together with a knowledge of the principal facts of Bible history, especially of the life of our Lord; and some understanding of, and familiarity with, the Book of Common Prayer, in order to its intelligent use.

The whole system of the school should have regard to this end, and the lessons of the lower class be a preparation for those of the higher. In order to effect this there must be a regular scheme of graduated and continuous teaching in each school. It is well that, to a great extent, the same subject should be simultaneously taught throughout the school. This plan, it is obvious, will greatly facilitate the instruction of the teachers in a class, and allow the delivery of a general address, or the catechising of the whole school on the lesson of the day—while it is almost essential with a view to examination.

Suitable notes of lessons (of which there is now no lack) may be issued to the teachers, and will not only facilitate their adhesion to the prescribed course, but also conduce to uniformity as well as correctness of teaching. Such notes, I need scarcely say, can never supersede the necessity, though they may lighten the labour, of preparation, and should, as a rule, not be used in the class.

In the diocese of Manchester, with a view to encourage and assist systematic teaching, the Board of Education has issued, for the last two years, a syllabus of lessons for the year, taken from the Old and New Testaments, the Catechism, and Prayer-book. In addition to this, notes on all the lessons for the use of teachers have been drawn up and published at a low charge, and the result of the year's work tested by an examination of teachers and scholars held under the auspices of the board at its close. This action has done much to promote systematic teaching.

I may subjoin some particulars for the information of those interested. The examination, which is purely voluntary, is held simultaneously in those rural deaneries which desire to participate in it. It is conducted by local examiners, while the questions are issued by the board. Prizes and certificates are awarded by the ruri-decanal association, towards the cost of which, however, the board contributes; while the best papers from each centre are sent up to compete for diocesan prizes and certificates, which are signed and distributed by the bishop.

The Rev. Chancellor Leeke, who conducted the latter examination, thus expresses himself in his report to the board:—"I beg to say how much I have been impressed with the necessity and the value of these examinations for Sunday-school teachers and scholars which you have instituted. It is clear that a great deal of pains has been taken both by scholars and teachers, and (I should presume) clergy, to secure good results."*

I may say that in my own rural deanery, and at least two others in Manchester, we have found the voluntary inspection of Sunday-schools by clergy and laymen appointed by the ruri-decanal association, of much benefit.

I have called attention to the vastness of the opportunity afforded to us in our Sunday-schools, and of the influence which the Church might exercise, through their means, upon the masses of the population. I have sought to show the special importance of their work in the present day. I have suggested as means calculated to promote their efficiency, and to render them equal to the demand made upon them:

1. More direct recognition of the Sunday-school as an important part of the Church's system, with a view to attract to it the services of intellectual, educated, and influential workers; and to impress upon our teachers the necessity of seeking to attain to greater efficiency in their work as well as to secure for our schools a more complete and orderly organisation.

2. That we should endeavour to make our Sunday-schools more bright and attractive, alike in external arrangement and in the method of conducting them.

3. That we should by every means endeavour to secure the co-operation of more and better-qualified teachers.

4. That more attention should be paid to systematic teaching in our Sunday-schools, and to distinctive Church teaching.

I should not like to close a paper which has necessarily dealt largely with human agency and machinery, without reminding myself and you that our work is the Lord's work, and that He alone can make it to prosper. The psalm that specially speaks of children as the gift of God, begins—"Except the Lord build the house, they

* The result of the first examination was on the whole encouraging. Examinations were held in six deaneries, at which 85 teachers and 1,628 scholars presented themselves. Of their papers, those of 28 teachers and 94 scholars were sent up for competition for diocesan prizes and certificates, and were thus classified:—1st class, 24; 2nd class, 46; 3rd class, 43; not classed, 9.

labour in vain that build it." I rejoice therefore greatly in the institution and increasing observance of the special days of intercession for Sunday-schools. Let these days be solemnly observed in our churches, our schools, our families, and our chambers of devotion. Nor this alone: but let there be more constant and earnest prayer offered by all Christian people, that God may water with the continual dew of his blessing these nurseries of his Church; then may we, through their means, look to see many souls won to Christ; a widening of the borders and a strengthening of the foundations of our National Church; and, what is far more important than this, a great and permanent revival of true religion throughout our land.

The Ven. Archdeacon BLUNT, M.A., Vicar of Scarborough and Rural Dean.

My subject is a purely practical one. It lies far out of the range of the theoretical and the speculative. It cannot commend itself to either speaker or hearer on the ground of novelty; it can scarcely claim to be interesting or attractive. And yet the result of our discussion this evening ought to be useful, and if any single clergyman or layman shall go back to his parish with hint or suggestion he feels he can put in practice, if any fresh class be started, or any new agency for Bible study be carried on, we shall not have met quite in vain.

"Kindred Agencies to Sunday-schools" (that is, I suppose, agencies for doing kindred work, though not on the lines of the Sunday-school), "their special importance at the present day." This is my part of this evening's subject. The careful, diligent, patient, prayerful study of the Scriptures—how best to promote that? The question has been asked over and over again, and has been as often answered. Yet we have not succeeded in making the Bible, which is every man's *possession*, every man's *treasure*, and that which lies on every man's shelf, hid in every man's heart—not even in the case of religious persons. The ignorance of some candidates for Holy Orders of even the New Testament is almost proverbial on the lips of examining chaplains; nor does a very busy pastoral life, with much visiting, and still more "serving of tables," offer many opportunities afterwards, unless they are conscientiously sought and eagerly seized upon. And yet we clergy must be scripture students: "Scribes instructed unto the kingdom of heaven, able to bring out of our treasure things new and old." Here, as elsewhere, we should be the natural leaders of the laity. Surely we ought to be ashamed to stand up and read a lesson which we do not understand and could not explain; and in order to do this our study must embrace the Bible as a whole, and not be confined to favourite passages. By our example and by our influence we should commend the life of study as well as the life of prayer and the life of Christian work. Endeavouring to keep abreast with the intellectual development of the age, we should be living protests

against that specious humility which is content with ignorance, as if that were what Saint Paul meant by "the foolishness of preaching," remembering that ignorance often falls the first victim to superstition, fanaticism, and unbelief. In an age like ours, beset with dangers from opposite sides, it may be well to ask whether there may not be more irreverence in the ignorance and neglect of the Bible than in the keenest criticism. We may pity while we condemn the destructive critic, who, after anxious study cannot accept our conclusions as to the authority of holy scripture; but we must condemn without pity and without excuse one who, believing the Scriptures to be the word of God, neither studies it nor reads it. And none can surely doubt which evil is more wide-spread. While we are confronted with one critic who rejects revelation inasmuch as he cannot prove it, every congregation contains those who practically reject revelation inasmuch they will not study it. While one person is unsettled by a profane criticism, a thousand suffer by a profane contempt. I venture, therefore, to claim a prominent place in the range of our aims as parish priests, for all agencies which promote the intelligent, careful, diligent study of the sacred volume, or rather sacred library, of the Scriptures—being persuaded that in addition to its spiritual importance such a study may be made attractive and most interesting even to the youngest and least educated, if only the teacher himself honestly loves it for its own sake, and is in hearty sympathy with each class of his scholars. In every department of its work, and towards every section of its members, the Church's function is to be *didaskalia* as well as *paraklesis*. The exhortations "Pray without ceasing," "Quench not the Spirit," must never be separated from those other, "Despise not prophesying," "Prove all things."

Suffer me now to indicate briefly some of those kindred agencies with which I happen to be familiar from experience, for supplementing Sunday-school work, by offering to other classes besides the children of the poor opportunities for that Bible study of which I have spoken. (1.) Beginning with those that lie nearest the Sunday school, let me mention the training of Sunday school teachers. In addition to that which is usual in all well-worked town parishes, the weekly preparation of his teachers by the clergyman in the lessons they have to teach, not to save them the trouble of study, but to stimulate and direct it, I would suggest, that where practicable, direct instruction should be given in the methods of teaching. Let a subject be chosen and a few of the more competent teachers be invited to write brief notes of a lesson upon it, showing how they would deal with it—divide it—apply it—with a short specimen of the catechetical method they would adopt. Let these papers be sent in (anonymously if you like) to the clergyman two or three days before the meeting, and then in the presence of the assembled teachers, let him read them aloud, point out their excellences—criticise their deficiencies, whether in matter or in manner, and conclude by giving his own notes upon the lesson. Directly and indirectly—on clergy and on teachers—the effect of this critical lecture will be most beneficial. It will interest, instruct, correct

both young and experienced alike, and enforce the essentials of a good lesson, (as of a good sermon)—which must be interesting, that the children may be attentive; instructive, that they may be taught; impressive, that they may be affected; practical, that they may be profited; personal, that they may be conscience-stricken. (2.) There is an advantage in establishing Sunday-school teachers' associations for one or more rural deaneries, into which each teacher of an associated school, if a communicant (and let me express the opinion that no other should be allowed to be teachers) shall be admitted as a member, and receive a card with suitable prayers of supplication and intercession. Besides lesser gatherings from neighbouring parishes, an annual service should be held, with Holy Communion if in the morning, or with short evening prayer if in the afternoon, with a sermon on some spiritual aspect of the work, followed by the annual meeting, at which a report of each of the associated schools should be read by the superintendent, and afterwards a paper with discussion upon some of the many questions connected with Sunday schools. A prize scheme may, with advantage, be engrafted upon the association (paid for by a small subscription from each school and the offertory at the service), for providing prizes for the boy and girl proved to be best in a written examination on the special subjects agreed upon by the committee. These agencies stimulate the work, give a sense of fellowship, especially to the few teachers in small schools, and, until some diocesan system of inspection or examination may be founded, promote the efficiency of the schools, the thoroughness of the instruction imparted in them, and the interest and enthusiasm of the teachers. (3.) To pass to agencies for children of other classes than those which attend our Sunday schools, it is encouraging to see signs of progress in the increasing number of Bible classes for children of the middle and upper sections of society. I would here make two suggestions. To these classes, as well as to confirmation classes, parents and teachers should be definitely invited. It is difficult to overestimate the direct advantage of the co-operation which may thus be secured, or the indirect gain even to the parent from the oblique application of the lesson addressed to his child. Again, the children themselves will be aroused to further interest, if, in addition to their oral catechising by the teacher, they are requested to catechise him. This may be done by their sending him, in writing, questions on any specially difficult passage before they read it, or any mere general enquiry on matters connected with the chapter. I feel I ought to apologise to such a body as this, for venturing to suggest such trifling details, or even alluding to the mode of conducting Bible classes, when I know that there is scarcely a clergyman here from a town parish, who would not anticipate all I might say. I will therefore only add, that I think it helps much to give a sense of fellowship to members of Bible classes, as well as to children in Sunday-schools, if on enrolling their names they are presented with cards of membership, containing simple suggestions for godly living, together with a prayer to be used on certain days for the teacher and the class; while the addition of a provident club, a missionary

association, a lending library, an occasional social evening or excursion, and above all a special evening service in church on the anniversary of the class, will give definite expression to that union with the teacher and with each other, which the mere attendance at a Bible class too often fails to effect. And such classes ought, I think, to be provided, at all events in town parishes, for each section of the community, for every age, for both sexes—from the simple exposition of a few verses at the close of the mothers' meeting to the Greek Testament or Church history class, and the exegetical lectures on holy scripture of the character of those delivered by the revered master of the Temple. These last will be found very acceptable to the more educated members of our congregations, who may well be invited to take notes and freely to ask questions. By agencies such as these we who have large town parishes may supplement our expository lectures and systematic public catechising in the church, as well as the instruction given in our Sunday-schools. Such are amongst the opportunities we may offer, to read and expound and pray with our people, as they are able to bear it and willing to receive it—providing milk for babes, strong meat for men—dividing to each in his season the word of God written. At all events this is one way of shewing our “readiness, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away erroneous and strange doctrines,” because it is one way (to quote the very terms of our ordination vow) of “using public and private monitions and exhortations to the whole within our cure.”

And now, leaving to others that may follow me, agencies of a more secular character, such as boys' and working men's clubs, with the one remark that the introduction of a distinctively religious element into them often defeats the object we have in view, and alienates those who might in time through them be brought under higher and more sacred influence, I will content myself with referring to one more “agency kindred to Sunday-schools.”

All classes, all teachers, all who gather for Bible reading, need, I think, some bond of fellowship. If there be unity of spirit there should be some outward expression of it, and the communicants' union may fitly become the centre of the parish organisation, in which the members may meet to pray with and for each other and the parish, to study together the devotional aspect of the Christian life, as suggested by the Book of Common Prayer, and to prepare for the holy communion, in which grace and strength and unity are best found. To such a union should be attached a circulating library, supported by a small subscription from the members, containing books of a sound and healthy character on holy scripture, the Prayer-book, Church history, Christian biography, missionary work, together with good doctrinal and practical sermons and other interesting religious books. These unions, or associations, or guilds, if wisely ordered, and only if wisely ordered, may offer all that is healthy and beneficial in the Wesleyan class meeting on the one hand, and in spiritual direction on the other, without the grave dangers and pernicious influences of either.

With as few rules as possible—and these neither capricious nor

fanciful—or perhaps with suggestions rather than rules, the communicants' union should aim not to regulate the Christian life by prescribing minute observances, but to quicken it by mutual sympathy and common prayer;—not to foster a morbid self-conscious religionism, or (and I would there were no occasion for me to add) an artificial and therefore hypocritical state of religious feeling by the reading of unwholesome devotional books, but to develop a free simple spirit, by cultivating the healthful, manly tone of religious feeling which breathes throughout the Book of Common Prayer;—not to bind fetters upon the conscience by adding burdens Christ has not sanctioned, but to help to keep the conscience pure, and therefore sensitive, healthy, and therefore true. Such a communicants' union will include all the confirmed members of Bible classes; will train young communicants, and edify the more experienced; will be a distinct association which confirmees may be persuaded to join, and where the waifs and strays—the strangers and pilgrims migrating from other parishes—may find a welcome and a home. And the intercourse between pastor and people which will grow out of such an association should, I think, be simple and natural, frank and profitable, so as neither to weaken the sense of individual moral responsibility in the youngest member, nor to encourage the exercise of spiritual dominion by the most arbitrary clergyman. This is the one “kindred agency to Sunday-schools” to which I humbly suggest all others should lead,—an agency useful more or less at all times,—but especially now when we are beset by the opposite dangers of a scornful or a godless scepticism, and an unhealthy and self-conscious pietism.

Finally, let us carry on these and other kindred agencies with hopefulness. Our foes are as manifold as they are great, but they are not overwhelming. Every age is tempted to think its own difficulties unique, and at times to despair of success. Against such foes, such difficulties, all agencies seem powerless. But after all, God's weapons are not *agencies* but *agents*, not measures so much as men, the wisdom and ability, the toleration and charity, the courage and patience, the faith and zeal—above all, the example and prayers of His servants. Men who despair are not generally the men who work, but men who argue and theorise, who speculate and dream, and the solution of many a difficulty is found by him who practically grapples with it. Could we all,—high churchmen, low churchmen, broad churchmen, Christ's followers within the Church, aye! and Christ's followers without the Church too,—be men of prayer, and men of sober zeal, strong, hopeful, faithful; then these agencies, or agencies better than these, would be formed as time and occasion required, and we should use them, and yet not trust in them, in the great warfare against God's enemies and ours—unbelief, superstition, ungodliness. And then, by God's good grace, the momentous issue, never uncertain, would, at least in this land, be hastened. We know that the truth itself has nothing to fear. We know that the truth must finally prevail. We know that error and evil must perish at the last, for only the Divine is eternal. But we may well fear lest by our unbelief of the truth, our perversion of the

truth, our neglect of the truth, we may hinder the "perfect consummation and bliss"—may ourselves delay the approach of that

"One far off Divine event
To which the whole creation moves."

God grant it be not so ! God grant that something to hasten that great advent every Christian man and woman may effect ! We cannot do much ; we can do something. Each of us, by God's grace, can at least bear witness to the truth in his character, his life, his conversation. Every such earnest, honest servant of Christ the Master is a living witness to Christ the Truth, which no argument can refute and no false philosophy contradict.

ADDRESSES.

Rev. A. E. HUMPHREYS, Vicar of St. Matthew's Cambridge.

In speaking on this subject I would confine myself to *our elder classes*, and mainly to our *lads and young men*. I shall not need to *prove* at any length the special importance at the present day of attention to every means of *deepening* and *widening* our Church's blessed influence over our youth—so early now impatient of control, self-assertive, independent, and yet so responsive to true sympathy. This pressing duty is everywhere being more and more acknowledged, both in the north and south. Coming from Cambridge to a Church Congress here in Sheffield, I naturally ask myself, "What is the spiritual life and progress of the Church in the north compared with the south in this respect ? How has it been affected by her success or want of success with her elder classes of scholars ?" Thinking of this, we in the south are sometimes in despair at the vast numbers reported as comprising the elder classes of our northern brethren's Sunday-schools, and wish we could learn of you how to make the fashion and public opinion of the south set, as it does with you, in favour of Bible-class membership.

But, then, Bible-class or elder scholar membership in itself is not all. Must one not go further than this ? Are the churches much fuller, then, of regular worshippers in the north than in the south ? Is the church-roll of earnest, regular communicants much larger ? Is the knowledge of the Bible and the practical grasp of Church doctrine much greater ? I hardly suppose material enough exists in any statistical form on which to base an answer to *these* questions ; but they are very vital questions ; for to my mind the true position of a Sunday-school is neither *in loco parentis*, nor exclusively *in loco pastoris*, but that of *parents' assistant* and *pastor's assistant* in one ; and therefore its function is the persuasive influence of an earnest, well-instructed Christian, who can give a reason for the hope that is in him ; the bringing this to bear with individual scholars upon their spiritual life ; and as the outward expression of this life, and the chief means of fostering it permanently, the inspiring in them of a real care for regular, intelligent, heartfelt worship as communicant members of their Church ; in brief, to help our scholars "to continue in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and prayers."

And if, with this view of the proper outcome of Sunday-school work before us, we should have reason to think that the proportion of Church worshippers, and devout communicants, and earnest Christian livers, is *not* larger, compared with

the population, in the northern dioceses than in the southern—if the proportion to population is much the same north and south, and in both cases *far below* what we desire—we must conclude that there is a great work still for our Sunday-schools, both north and south, to do in carrying out their high principles. And we in the south, if (as has been said) we teach those scholars whom we have with well-grounded teaching and good effect, *we* should strive earnestly after a *widening* of the work and influence with *our* elder classes; while you in the north may find fresh scope for all spiritual energy in *deepening* the work and influence with *your* classes, and making them *mean* more than ever.

How then may we *widen*? How *deepen*? One most important means of *deepening* was dwelt upon by the first speaker—better educated teachers, with more systematic teaching. I would speak rather, now, of some practical methods of *widening* our work that seem of value. They are doubtless already in practice in many places far better than with us at Cambridge. But still let *each* speak out and act out. It is the *constant* dropping that hollows the hard stone. Forgive me, then, if I speak of the University Sunday-school, at Cambridge, with which I am still connected, and in which I was privileged for some years to superintend the work of some eighty undergraduates as teachers. During the half-century that Jesus Lane School has been taught by successive generations of University men, much training in good Sunday-school management must have been learnt, which has since borne good fruit far and wide in English parishes; so much so, that I remember good old Mr. Vores, of Hastings, a distinguished Oxford man himself, telling me once—will my Oxford hearers pardon it?—that whenever he had a Cambridge man for a curate he always felt *happy* about his Sunday-school! I would hope that similar good may be produced now at Cambridge, by our endeavouring to show there, amongst many successive teachers of quick zeal and devotion, that it is possible to grapple with this great difficulty of the *present* half-century—the retaining of our elder scholars.

Let me quote, then, something from an account prepared by the present superintendent, the Rev. R. Appleton, and myself, some time ago, as to our efforts with regard to elder lads:—

“It occurred to us that our one Bible-class was a mistake; some would not join where so-and-so was a member; some were not drawn by the one teacher. In general, I suppose, a Bible-class should not contain a mixture of boys of widely different ages. Young men of eighteen will not come if there is a large element of lads of fifteen, and the younger ones feel out of place by the side of the older. Hence, if it is sought to form a Bible-class for the first time, it would be well that two should be created together, one of older, and one of younger lads. Even in a small country village it will be found worth while, I believe, to aim at this; and in a large town school it will be possible of course to form classes in greater numbers, and to secure more evenness in their constituents. I am speaking from an experience of classes of ten to twelve members, under the charge of young men, of which we now have nine in connection with our school: with fuller classes and more experienced teachers, the proposition must doubtless be modified.

“I may further be allowed to urge the great importance of securing a separate room (and that cheerful and inviting) for each Bible-class; and, parallel with this, the advantage of preserving a fairly intimate connection between the Bible-class and the main school—not to be secured in general, I venture to think, by bringing the class in to the opening or closing, but by the individual interest and sympathy of the superintendent with the scholars and teacher, and by seizing all such small opportunities as may present themselves, and can be made.

“Let me next throw out a suggestion towards some solution of one crucial difficulty—I mean the retention of boys between the ages of thirteen and fifteen, when they are just beginning to leave day-school for work, and catching the spirit of independence both at home and at school. Too young for Bible-classes, and yet too old to come willingly as a part of the children, they seem to require some inter-

mediate position. Five or six years ago we formed the first six classes of boys below the Bible-classes into a separate group under the name of the 'first division;' we adopted with them a somewhat more manly and confidential tone, and strove to make their connection with the teachers a more personal matter, giving them at the same time some slight distinguishing privileges, and, just as it were, anticipating rather than ignoring their growing sense of their own importance. A few very simple artifices have indicated the position in which we desire them to feel themselves: their classes are called by the teachers' names, in lieu of numbers; magazines are lent to them from one Sunday to the next; the classes are in a room by themselves, with rather different hours of attendance from the rest—one of their teachers being sectional superintendent of them. Thus they are tolerably well marked off (and are fully conscious of it) from the Bible-classes on the one hand, and from the lower part of the school on the other. I may add that we are well satisfied with the results obtained. The boys have stayed with us far more uniformly, and attended with greater regularity, and are marked by a higher tone and appreciativeness than before. The older classes below the first division are attached to us by the prospect of the rise in position; the first division classes look forward to the Bible-class. Still more, the somewhat closer connection with the teachers, and the greater individual sympathy possible and natural with them, is a valuable support against the peculiar temptations of that age, and an important aid to thoughts about confirmation. Confirmation itself is usually the boundary line between the first division and the Bible-class."

I would speak next on the assistance to be derived from a youths' educational and social club, similar in principle to the signally successful institute connected with Mr. Tabrum's name, at Islington. The secret of success in these is to be found generally in the personal influence of some friend of youth who will, through constant oversight, be largely though not obtrusively autocratic. Such a club was established by us some six years ago, at Cambridge, with a strong but not exclusive connection with the Jesus Lane School.

In our Youths' Club, or, as we have re-named it, the Albert Institute, we have (1) a reading-room, supplied with newspapers and periodicals of a pure tone, and with chess, draughts, and other indoor games of similar character; a writing-room, senior members' coffee and conversation-room; (2) a lending library, whose shelves it has been a constant aim to fill with books of travel, trade, tale, poetry, history, religion, that youths *will* read and find interesting, not merely with books that they *ought* to read; (3) educational classes, of which each member is expected to attend two in the week regularly; (4) fortnightly lectures and entertainments, the principle being to obtain every *illustration* possible for a lecture and every help possible *from members* for an entertainment; (5) brass and flute bands, hand-bell company, and glee society, music being a proved attraction and preservative for good; (6) cricket and rowing clubs, with athletics and swimming, in the summer season, and a specially built and fitted gymnasium, for the winter months.

The management of the institute is entrusted to a senior committee of reference and a managing committee, composed of the officers of the senior committee, and members elected by the whole club; and a member of the managing committee is always present in the reading-room during hours. The opening each night is with a short prayer or the collect of the week; the closing with some specially chosen and printed hymn. The educational classes, which commenced last night for our new winter season, comprise drawing, reading, writing, dictation, arithmetic, French, Latin, shorthand, book-keeping, electricity, elocution, and divinity. Prizes for Bible questions, essays, chess and draught tournament, &c., will be also given. The last mentioned of these classes, the divinity class, is for this season a series of "Talks with our Sunday-school teacher members," and its first two evenings are occupied with "The First Day of Teaching: First Impressions and First Difficulties," "The Preparation of a Lesson: what Books to Us, and How to Use Them." Bible-class teachers may thus meet their scholars here in the week, either

by undertaking the charge of an educational class, or merely over a chess or draught-board.

To take but one or two instances of encouraging results out of the many, one youth, drawn in to our club, its influences and its classes, rises, through shorthand learnt there, to an important clerkship in a busy midland town, and zealously labours as a Sunday-school teacher. Another, who has been helped similarly to confirmation, to self-improvement, and to Sunday-school teaching, writes to me from a responsible position in one of our eastern county towns: "I often wish we had a club like the Albert here." And not to weary you with single cases; such facts as these, that our Bible-classes grew within four years from *two* to *nine*, and that we now have three Sunday-schools largely supplied with Bible-class and Institute members for male teachers, will serve to give assurance of the good results which a youths' club may help materially to bring about.

Nor need such an institution be so elaborate as that I have sketched. I know of several, both in villages and country towns, quite simple and workable, yet most useful; and I know, too, of more than one somewhat similar association for girls and young women engaged all day at work.

I had intended next to urge the immediate establishment of a "Friendly Society for Young Men," for the whole of England, similar to that already so well organised for girls. The suggestion for such a society was made some time back by the Rev. C. P. Ford, of St. Mark's, Birkenhead, one of my old teachers at Jesus Lane School. But I was thankful beyond measure to find on a notice put into my hand this morning, that matters had got so much further that the Bishop of Lichfield was actually to preside at the inauguration of the society this very day. I have since attended with the greatest pleasure this inaugural meeting, and would bespeak all your interest and sympathy for the new society, that you may aid it in its object, viz., "to help young men both temporally and spiritually; to befriend young men leaving home or moving from one place to another, and to protect them from evil influences; to find suitable situations and employment for the members of the society; and to promote a healthy tone of literature and amusement among young men." I hope most earnestly that *all* Bible-class teachers will join the society as associates, and thus form what is deeply wanted—a union of Bible-class teachers, for interchange of thought and plan, for mutual strengthening, and for common prayer. I hope, too, that very many other godly laymen will become associates, to help, by guidance, prayer, and sympathy, those young men who shall be assigned to their care; and learning thus the privilege and the practicability of being really useful in this way, will be emboldened to become Bible-class teachers too.

In conclusion, then, by methods such as these, or wiser, I trust that the various social classes will attain a closer union; the right hand of manly Christian fellowship will be held out when most needed by our younger brethren; our Church will be widening, by God's mercy, her holy influence over England's next generation of men.

Rev. CECIL HOOK, All Souls', Leeds.

AFTER the remarks which have fallen from the last speaker concerning the superior training of Cambridge men for Sunday-school work, I shall have to ask your indulgence, for I am an Oxford man. Yet I take great interest in Sunday-schools and believe much in their importance, especially in the present day. No one would dare to accuse a Yorkshireman of not believing in the Sunday-school system. We delight in them. Our schools are full, our teachers are many; and I cannot but

think that the committee have made an error in not supplying some lay speakers on a subject such as this. Our vicar of Leeds could have brought fifty such speakers with him, and men, too, who would say something worth hearing.

The subject before us is the special importance of Sunday-schools in the present day, and I wish to speak particularly of those Sunday-schools which are found in large towns, and perhaps more particularly from the clerical side of the question.

1. In *what way* are Sunday-schools useful?

2. And how may they be utilised for children of various classes in society?

These are the two questions I would ask, and endeavour briefly to answer. In the first place, the importance of the Sunday-school as an engine of instruction is much exaggerated. A day-school has five days in the week and more than four hours in each day to impart its instruction. The teachers are not only well up in their subjects, but also trained to teach them. And yet, after all, the ordinary day-school does not succeed as a rule in turning out very erudite scholars. The Sunday-school has one day in the week, and little more than two hours on that day. The discipline is from the voluntary nature of the school naturally inclined to be defective; the teachers, untrained or only partially trained in the art of instruction, are, as a rule, very little able to impart knowledge which they may perhaps themselves but imperfectly possess. As engines of positive instruction our Sunday-schools must be lacking in power. Nor should we forget this fact, and burst forth into lamentations when they do not appear as successful as we could wish. That habit of grumbling, by the way, is a very bad one: if we would keep our eyes open a little more to see the blessings poured upon our work, and be a little more ready cheerfully to overlook the points which may at times disappoint us, we should do better. Be proud of your schools; make the children proud of them, and they will soon be worthy of your pride; but go on grumbling at each little fault, at each sign of imperfection, and you will soon persuade yourself that they are not worth caring for, and the children and teachers will only too readily take up your lead: all *esprit-de-corps* will be lost, and the schools become a miserable failure. Go heartily and hopefully to work, be cheery over it, put life into it, cultivate a thankful heart, don't expect too much, and specially, don't expect that very much can be actually taught and learned in Sunday-school.

Having seen what Sunday-schools can not do, let us see what they can do, and how best to push that work:

It is often said of the younger classes of our public schools that though the boys do not learn much, they learn how to learn. And I think that this may be predicated of our Sunday-schools; though we cannot teach *much* of the deep truths of religion, we can teach how they are to be learned, and where they are to be found. We can stir up in the young mind a curiosity about sacred things which will one day insist upon being satisfied. A great means to this end is the publication of plain lists of subjects to be taught, and work to be done.

The Church Sunday School Institute has done much in this direction, and has encouraged a regular *system* in teaching and an arrangement and heading of subjects, which is in itself an instruction.

Now I should recommend that such lists of work should if possible be printed by each school for itself. Of all things, don't be afraid to print: a little money spent in printing amply repays itself. Shopkeepers find this to be the case; so may the superintendents of Sunday-schools. Things are plainer in print: and, I believe, most persons have a sort of idea that anything printed must be true and good. Let us turn this little superstition to good account. These lists of work should be renewed each quarter, and every child as well as every teacher should have one to take home. They are, I know, often talked over at home, and they carry their own lesson. A carefully selected course, explanatory of the Prayer-book, would open

the eyes of many parents as well as children to the fact that there is something worth studying in our Prayer-books as well as our Bibles. A carefully headed course on the Acts of the Apostles may lead many to a more diligent perusal of its chapters as a Church history; and, for my own part, I cannot understand a person rising from such a study—a Dissenter.

Here, then, is a source of importance for Sunday-schools, not only to the scholars who will be taught *how* to study their Prayer-books and Bibles, but also to the homes from which those scholars come.

And again, Sunday-schools are important as inculcating a high moral tone in our children. (I speak, myself, especially of Sunday-schools in a parish where there are no Church day-schools). This must come *from* the children themselves. It must become the *fashion* of the school to be good—high-minded—pure in tongue and action. You know how quickly fashions are picked up by children: one month you stumble over a peg-top at every corner; another you are bowled over by a hoop in every street; another you are in danger of your life as you pick your way among marbles, or run the gauntlet of skipping-ropes. Well, let the children make it the fashion to be good; take care to show your approbation of good conduct; encourage truth by making small offenders come and bravely declare their fault, instead of waiting for others to tell; and, of all things, keep down the tell-tale.

To enable a school to do real work in this way, we must be ready remorselessly to weed out the promoters of evil. Superintendents will not like it, as it must now and then tell on the numbers, but it must be done for the good of the school. This plan gives much trouble; for those weeded out must not be lost, but watched over and looked after, and, at the first sign of real improvement, restored. But the weeding principle is, I am certain, good, wholesome, and necessary to produce a healthy moral tone in a town Sunday-school.

And the Sunday-schools are important as introducing a serious and religious tone among the children of a parish. As the last came *up* from the children, this must come down from the teachers. It is taught not by a coarse familiarity of manner when teaching or speaking of sacred things; not by a condescension of demeanour when trying to teach children; but by a quiet and reverential comportment, a solemnized tone of voice and manner when treating of sacred subjects, which should contrast with the more genial and homely way of chatting with the children when merely discussing their home affairs and little everyday interests. Children are shrewd critics, and they can tell very quickly whether a teacher is teaching from his heart, or merely from his head or a book.

It will not be long ere a teacher coming to his or her work in this manner, will have inculcated a religious tone in the class which will spread in the school, and swearing or joking on sacred subjects will almost of necessity die out. Would that Church Congresses would learn the same lesson; and that men would blush to talk lightly or make jests of the most sacred things of our faith, or turn into ridicule things sacred by association to the souls of their neighbours. To facilitate the growth of such a tone, we who have the control of Sunday-schools should not be afraid, from time to time, when we see it to be absolutely necessary for the good of the school, to quietly urge and accept the resignation of a teacher who is found on trial to be unfitted for the work.

So many people in Yorkshire are ready to try their hands at teaching in a Sunday-school that great caution is necessary in accepting or urging offers of assistance in this way. It has been said to me many times when speaking seriously to a parishioner on his or her godless life,—“Well, I don’t mind trying to be better—I’ll come and teach a bit in your Sunday-school.” The answer is invariably—“Begin at home; teach yourself and learn yourself before you can possibly hope to be of

assistance to others." No!—it is a necessity to our Sunday-schools, if they are to be of importance in these days of laxity of faith and religion, that all their staff should consist of regular and earnest communicants.

Now, in the third place, I should say that Sunday-schools are important in teaching children an intelligent and a firm love for their Church.

Souls are endangered far less by false teaching and a false practice of religion, than by a laxity of principle which must end in a loss of faith. I would rather deal with a conscientious chapel-goer of any sort than with the person who goes to any chapel, or chaps about from chapel to church, from church to chapel, from chapel to lecture-hall, until his faith is utterly ruined and his life utterly spoiled.

Our Sunday-schools are to teach an understanding of, and a hearty love for our Church. They are to take up the sponsors' promise, and to teach our children the meaning of the solemn promise, vow, and profession made for them in holy baptism. They are to guide and lead them to their solemn preparation for confirmation. They are to implant in them an earnest desire to become earnest communicants. They are to teach them such reverence in God's house as may carry with it a conviction of God's special presence there. They are to teach them to understand and value the liturgical services of the Church. They are to teach them, as children, so to love their Church and her services that in after life in their troubles, their sorrows, their joys, their difficulties, they may know where to fly and find God's presence near; in fact, to find in her their tender nursing mother.

It is time for me to cease, so I will only add that the great means to this end is the use of bright children's services separate from the longer services suited to the adult members of the Church. And these services should not be merely fancy services. They should always be more or less liturgical in form, and held in church. I believe our plan to be good which provides a regular shortened matins for children and teachers before their morning school, at which attendance is voluntary, (and in our case large); and an afternoon service with hymns, prayer, metrical litany and catechising, at which the schools should attend as a body. I wanted much to have spoken on the second division of my subject, namely, the adapting of our Sunday-schools for the use of the upper middle classes, but time forbids, and I must conclude at once, only expressing my earnest hope and heart's desire that the Almighty Father may bless and prosper the labour of love carried on in our Sunday-schools, that a future generation may rise up to bless us for our endeavours in their behalf, and that our efforts, feeble and poor as they may be, shall be found an acceptable sacrifice to Him, in whose face the angels of the little ones do ever gaze with adoring love.

Rev. J. B. DRAPER, Vicar of All Saints', Sheffield.

It is a disadvantage of gatherings of this sort, when the speeches are prepared, that two speakers may travel along the same line. Perhaps if you find I am bringing out some of the thoughts of the Rev. T. A. Stowell, you may pardon it on that ground.

The subject of our Sunday-schools is of itself so wide, that in these remarks it will be best to confine myself strictly to the line of thought suggested by the words descriptive of our subject, viz., "Sunday-schools," and, what are called "*kindred agencies*"—their importance at the present day. *Why I think* they are specially important, will be evident as I proceed to offer two or three suggestions as to what I think our Sunday-classes ought to be.

1. The Sunday-classes of young Churchmen should be *an antidote to the evil*

caused by the separation of classes, which is now so prominent a feature in modern life. Never was there a time when the rich and the poor came less together than they do now. The establishment of so many limited companies in trade has caused the masters and the workmen to see much less of each other in the way of business, and to feel less interest in each other's welfare, than ever they did. As soon as a man has become a little richer than he was, he moves his residence, which was among his less fortunate neighbours, to what is called a *fashionable suburb*, among more aristocratic companions. In this way and in many other ways, a very little addition to a man's income separates him and his family from the families of those who are less successful than himself in the race of life.

No one can say that the result is satisfactory; but if the Sunday-school, or the class of young men or young women meeting on Sunday afternoon, were regarded by Churchmen as they ought to be, these might be made an important help towards counteracting the evils of this separation. Why should not the well-to-do and better educated members of our Church give up a portion of every Lord's-day to the holding friendly and Christian intercourse with young people of the class not so well off as themselves? I know that very many, even of our well educated people, will say, "We cannot teach: we could not sustain a conversation on religious subjects with these young people for five minutes." And probably this is to a certain extent true; yet it would be possible for even these to spend a profitable hour with half a dozen young men or young women on Sunday afternoons. At least they could read together; and a little kindly and Christian intercourse would be of immeasurable value in softening some of the hardness of life, and in brightening the Sundays of many of those who have a great deal to darken their week-days. The educated members of our Church have not, as a body, risen to the height of their calling—"As everyone hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another." They do not realise, as they might, the need for each of them to do something to unite *all* the members of our Church into one firm and glorious body. Often is the problem stated, How shall we promote unity in the Church? I believe that one solution of this great problem—How to bring together more effectually the rich and the poor of our Church, and unite them as one family in Christ, lies in our Sunday-schools. *There* is the great opportunity for friendly intercourse: *there* is a place where one of the evils of week-day life may be healed. It is not enough that the rich and the poor should just see one another in the sittings of the same church, although it is a great advantage for them to do that—but they should have Christian intercourse. And the union of Churchmen will be most complete, and most effective for the good of our country and the welfare of our Church, when the educated Churchman uses his education and his knowledge of God's word in doing good amongst the young on Sundays.

Talking with an old Sunday-school teacher the other day, he spoke of the great strides which the United States of America were making in matters connected with his trade: and he reminded me that in America, Sunday-schools are made much of; and Christian people in that country recognise more than we do in this, the duty of *doing* good on Sunday, as well as of *getting* good. And he said "That community is always the most prosperous in commerce, and successful in social matters, in which Christian people take most interest in their Sunday-schools." Of course my friend was an enthusiast, but he said what he believed to be true; and I am not ashamed to say that I agree with him. It has been proved in very many instances that the Sunday-school is a mighty influence for good. And I have met with observant men who have been bold enough to affirm that they have found the moral tone of a town higher or lower in proportion as what are called the better classes of that town take an interest in or neglect their Sunday-schools.

If this be so, what a great responsibility lies upon the many thousands of our

educated Churchmen and Churchwomen! Should not the Church of Christ take the lead in bringing together those whom the world separates? What is the use of our talking about the unity of Christians, if in practice we carry out the theory that it will be time enough to be on friendly terms with some of our fellow Christians when we get to heaven? Far better will it be to be on terms of friendship with young Christians now; and the Sunday-school—or the class-room in connection with it—is at least a *good place* for the cultivation of that friendship. Here, then, is one ground for regarding Sunday-schools as specially important in the present day. They might be the means of bridging over somewhat of the separation of classes which all the week-day influences seem to make wider every day.

2. I regard the Sunday-school and its subsidiary classes as the best place for teaching *by example* that gospel of love which is taught *by word* in the New Testament. I am thankful to know that in nearly all elementary schools—even in Board-schools—the Bible is taught—at least *the words of it*. This is a great blessing; but in order that *true religion* may be taught, it seems to me that an example of it is necessary. The Sunday-school ought to be the one place in each parish where that example is sure to be found. It ought to be the one place from which the spirit of rivalry, of envy, of self-seeking, and of every evil is most carefully excluded. It ought to be the place where the precepts of the Great Master about washing one another's feet are to be seen in the act of fulfilment; and where the young people of our congregations may come, aye! and to which they *will* come, in order to enjoy the sweet and holy influences of the Saviour's presence; and also to learn who is the Lord Jesus, and what is His gospel; and they should do this by experiencing the love of those who call themselves His disciples. In the present state of society I know of no better place for this teaching by practical illustration than the Sunday-school. Let our Churchmen regard the Sunday-school in this light, and then they will be doing very much towards making our Church what she ought to be—the best living illustration of that which the angels proclaimed at the Saviour's birth,—“Peace on earth; good will towards men.”

Never was it more important than at the present day that the power of the gospel to heal all social disorders should be known. Not only should Jesus be preached from our pulpits, but there ought to be living illustrations of his love to be seen and met with every Sunday. The enemies of true religion may ask with a sneer, “Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?” The Church points to her Sunday-schools, and says, “Come and see.”

A third point is worth a few words: How are we to make our Sunday-schools more efficient? And the question may be asked, What is efficiency in a Sunday-school? I hold that *that* Sunday-school *alone* is efficient in which the spirit of Christian love prevails. That Sunday-school is an efficient one in which the clergyman of the parish is on the most friendly terms with the teachers, and in which his presence is felt as joy and peace. The test of efficiency which I should like to apply to a Sunday-school is not merely an examination into the thoroughness and accuracy of the scholars' knowledge of the Bible and of the Prayer-book, although that ought to be able to stand a good trial; but I should like to institute a comparison of the conduct and character of the teachers with what is said about love in the xiii. chapter of the 1st epistle to the Corinthians. I am sure that that school is efficient where for more than an hour every Sunday afternoon *that chapter is lived*. That school would not want for scholars, and the results of teaching them would be most satisfactory. But how is this to be attained? It is to be attained by the members of the Church of England rising above the spirit of religious selfishness, up to the spirit of self-denial for the Lord's sake. The Christianity of the New Testament is very beautiful, but it is a thing to be lived—not merely admired.

"Where is the text," many of our good Christian people will ask, "Where is the text that puts the Sunday-school prominently forward as the great Christian work of this age?" I say, read in the light of the present day, this is the one:—"We ought to lay down our lives for the brethren."

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. J. W. GEDGE, Diocesan Inspector of Schools in the Diocese of Winchester.

I STAND here to-night as the representative of the Sunday School Institute, on the committee of which I have sat for a good many years. I wish to speak on two subjects. First—The training of Sunday-school teachers; and then the teaching of doctrine in Sunday-schools. First of all the training of Sunday-school teachers. There is, indeed, a need for that. I will tell you a true story. A clergyman told me that he was obliged to give up his schools to the school board, reserving, however, the first hour for religious instruction. He appointed a teacher for the purpose, but as there were one hundred and fifty scholars he had to get some one to help her. A young man came forward for the purpose, and he said, "What shall I teach?" The clergyman said, "Teach the younger children the Lord's Prayer, two or three words at a time." My friend left the young man alone for a few mornings, and then, when he went to the school, he found the teacher with a black board on which these words were written, "Name thy kingdom," which the children were repeating one after the other. On asking what it meant, the young man said: "You told me to teach the Lord's Prayer three words at a time. The first day I took the words, 'Our Father which,' the next, 'art in heaven,' the next, 'hallowed be thy,' and I have got this morning to 'Name thy kingdom.'" And this was a Sunday school teacher! How can we train them? In the first place we must get them to study. A gentleman to-night said to me on the way to this hall, that in his Sunday-school teachers knew but little more than the children. Then, in God's name, let us cause them to study. And, as a stimulus to study, the Sunday School Institute has provided an annual examination, to which this year more than twelve hundred teachers have had the boldness to come forward and submit themselves to a test as to their knowledge. I should like to see another twelve hundred come forward. As a second test, I recommend the training class, as being very useful and profitable. I conducted one the other day at Liverpool, in the presence of two hundred and fifty teachers, who came to hear a class taught by an experienced teacher. Teachers cannot but get good from such an operation. Then again let your younger teachers learn for three months how to teach, by taking their places as scholars in the classes of the most experienced teachers in the schools, and in that space of time they will have learnt something as to the method of teaching, and the important matter of discipline. I want to say a word as to the teaching of doctrine—of the two classes of doctrine, viz., general Christian doctrine and specific Church doctrine. I do not think that with all our pains there is enough dogmatic teaching in our Sunday-schools. What do we learn in our Church at the baptism of our children, but that they must be taught, first, the Creed, then the Lord's Prayer and Ten Commandments, and then the Church Catechism? Most of our teachers go on quite the opposite tack, and whilst giving the children Bible stories, omit the practical doctrines arising out of them. If they were to follow the Church's guidance, and teach, first, the Creed—illustrating it to any extent by bible stories—

and then the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments, not merely by rote, but with a full, clear, and thorough understanding of their meaning and application to every-day life, the children would have learnt something definite and tangible in the Sunday-school. Let me say a word for the good old Church Catechism. As an Inspector of Schools, first under Government and then diocesan, I have examined in the last ten years just half a million children in the Church Catechism. You would, perhaps, have thought that that was enough to tire any man of it. Not a bit of it. I love the Church Catechism more every day I live. Our Church takes that calm and sober and moderate line of Church doctrine, especially with regard to the Sacraments, which is, to my mind, most in accordance with the teaching of the Bible and catholic antiquity. Not long ago a clergyman said to me, "I tell my Sunday-school teachers to leave all their churchmanship behind the school doors." My reply to him was: "I wonder whether Mr. Spurgeon tells his teachers to leave their baptismal doctrine behind them at their Sunday-school door?" Our children should be able to answer the questions, not only, "Why am I a Churchman?" but, "Why am I not a Romanist?" and "Why am I not a Dissenter?" But after all, our Sunday-school teachers cannot do much. They are too often men and women with but little learning and training, and therefore their work needs to be supplemented by the parish priest. I wish to say a word on behalf of public catechising. Let the one hour of the afternoon be devoted to the public catechising of the children in church under the parish priest, at which service not only the children, but the servants and the apprentices, and all the young people of the congregation should attend. Our Sunday-school teachers are too selfish. They want all the time on Sunday at which the children are to be got. I will tell you what I consider a model idea of a Sunday school—one hour in the morning, half an hour in the afternoon, and an hour's service and catechising in church. A friend of mine conducts his catechising on this plan:—he gathers together in the course of the week all his teachers, and selecting the lesson, he says: "This is to be the lesson for next Sunday," and picking out some one point, he dwells upon it for half an hour; and says to them, "You may teach anything else you like, but you must first teach the children my subject," and on the following Sunday he catechises all the children, numbering about one thousand, on this point. Therefore you see that one definite point is taught in the school in that parish every Sunday in the year; and one point on a Sunday is fifty-two points in the year, and is five hundred and twenty points in the ten years that children are generally kept in our Sunday-schools. But with all our model lessons and our trained teachers, do not let us go away from this hall without the conviction strong upon our minds that it is personal religion that we want to teach these children, and that our Sunday-school teachers should be to them a model of what a Christian can be. I have seen one or two wonderful sights in my time. I have seen a Sunday-school of former savages, men and women gathered together Sunday after Sunday in New Zealand, and have seen them partaking together of the blessed Sacrament. I have seen in my father's school, in Northampton, a Sunday-school teacher go up to the Lord's table, followed by forty members of his class. But I hope, if I reach heaven, to see a more wonderful sight still—I hope to see a whole army of Sunday-school teachers and Sunday-school children together around the throne of God for ever.

Rev. J. M. TOWNSEND, Vicar of Searby, Lincolnshire.

COMING to address you on the importance of Sunday-schools and kindred means of teaching our children, and appearing before you as a perfect stranger, I may be permitted to say that I learned my own catechism from hearing my father catechise children in the parish church on Sunday afternoons, and for the last thirty-five years but very few Sundays have passed without my practising the same thing myself. It is very remarkable that from the earliest days of the Church up to the present time the importance of catechising has been continually brought before us, and pressed upon our notice, and yet that practice has been very much forgotten and neglected. It has been very wisely said, that comparatively few of the uneducated classes are capable of properly understanding sermons unless they have been themselves present at catechising. When I speak of catechising in Church I do not mean to say that we should confine ourselves to the Church catechism every Sunday, but we should pay particular attention to it on the Sundays in Lent. On the other Sundays during the year, the Sunday-school teachers might see that the scholars read the gospel of the day, that they might be catechised on it in the presence of the congregation at church. And one advantage of that practice you will find to be this, that your Sunday-school teachers are themselves instructed as well as the Sunday scholars. Then again as to the other appliances, which are supplementary to and helping the Sunday-school. The school in my parish is not a Board school, but a certified elementary school; and therefore it is necessary that secular education should be imparted during two hours in the morning. The religious instruction, therefore, is given in this way: the teacher and the scholars come to the shortened matins choral—the best office I know of for children—and are catechised in each of the five days in the week on some religious subject. The younger children are catechised about the creed, and the older ones are questioned about the first lessons so long as they are historical. And while we instruct them in the scriptural subjects, we never forget the importance of teaching them what our Lord reproved the two disciples for not knowing, namely, that Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms are ever speaking to us concerning Christ. And although we follow out this plan, and impress upon the children the typical meaning of Holy Scripture—and particularly of the Old Testament—we find that our scholars are by no means wanting in their acquaintance with scriptural facts and history. In our part of the world there is a scheme for giving prizes to Sunday scholars. This year I sent one of our little boys to compete in that prize scheme, and it was a great gratification to me to find that he carried off the first prize. But in this course of instruction by catechising, whilst remembering the importance of showing how all Holy Scripture instructs us about Christ and his Church, we must not forget how important a place the catechism gives to the teaching of our children—how it was they became members of Christ's Church; and I maintain that no child has been rightly instructed who leaves our Sunday-schools without being able to show why he is a member of the Church of England, instead of joining the Roman communion or a Dissenting denomination; for he has not received the instruction which his mother the Church intended him to have, unless he has been taught that if he joins the Roman obedience he will thenceforward be debarred from drinking the precious blood of Christ, without which "There is no life in him," and which alone "Cleanses from all sin;" and on the other hand, if he joins a sect, it is, to say the least, extremely doubtful whether the bread and wine which is given him (if it is given), is "verily and indeed the body and blood of Christ" at all. I spoke just now of a little boy who gained a prize. I was catechising my

children not long ago on the creed, and I asked first of all, "What does believing mean?" and they said "Thinking something to be true because somebody told us." I asked, "What do you call it when it is something that God tells you?" and they said, "It is faith." I said "Do all people believe that creed?" and they replied "No;" and I said, "Why don't they believe it?" I will tell you what that little boy answered—and you can judge for yourselves how much truth there is in his answer:—he said, "Because they don't want to." The fact is men do not believe what they don't "want to," and it is the wilfulness of unbelief which constitutes its chief sin.

Rev. JOHN EDDOWES.

WHEN the last speaker but one had uttered a few sentences, I felt tempted to withdraw the card which I had sent up to the chair, for he gave expression to the truth which I desired to enforce, viz., that the Sunday-schools of the Church are to be regarded, not (as a previous speaker has stated) as the handmaid of the parent or the pastor, but rather as the handmaid of the godparent. Among the poor some godparents are *unwilling*, and many from various circumstances *unable*, to fulfil the obligation they undertook when they responded for the child, to see it brought up to lead a godly and a Christian life. To meet such cases the Sunday-school steps in. The Church, moreover, has clearly laid down the lines upon which the instruction of the child is to be given. He is to be taught the Catechism—and especially the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments. In other words, we are to give to our children a rule of faith, a rule of prayer, and a rule of life. We are to teach them, too, of the solemn vow, promise, and profession they have made, of the grace they have received, and of the obligation in which the reception of that grace involves them. One word about the Sunday-school teacher. We are too apt, in consequence of the scarcity of teachers, to take at once those who offer themselves, or who come simply recommended by another teacher, and they pass into our schools, whether they are fitted for the office or not. May I suggest that it might be well for the parish priest to give them, as it were, mission for their work in some formal manner, just as in some of our parishes a chorister is formally admitted into the choir by a short service, in the course of which he is invested with a surplice. Then with regard to the preparation of the Sunday-school teacher. I speak only now of his *mental* preparation. He must be taught in order to teach others. The practice of my own parish is for the curate, who has special charge of the Sunday-school, to instruct the teachers each Sunday afternoon on the subject of the following Sunday's catechising. I do not want to say anything against the Church Sunday School Institute, though I am not one of its ardent admirers. I would, however, recommend in preference to its books, a little publication called "Holy Teachings," published by Mowbray at a penny a month. Every teacher, too, should have in his hands some such manual as "Sadler's Church Doctrine, Bible Truth." We must cease to take the children to church to sit through three services rolled into one on a Sunday morning. They must have bright hearty services of their own, and those services not in a school-room, but in the church, where God's altar stands. We shall do well, also, to gather the children into guilds—and if I might recommend my own practice, I would say—have two guilds, one for children up to the age of confirmation, and the other for those who have been confirmed, that they may be kept to Holy Communion. I am persuaded that if we work our Sunday-schools thus, simply and clearly on the lines of the Church, we shall raise

up a band of valuable Church defenders—Church-truth defenders—or, what is the same thing, Bible-truth defenders, in this sceptical age, and come what assailant may, “we shall not be ashamed when we speak with our enemies in the gate.”

Rev. J. T. SMITH, Bedford.

I SENT up my card at the beginning of this section of the Congress because I thought it most likely that a good many Sunday-schools teachers in Sheffield would attend this meeting, who had not attended other meetings during the week. I wish to follow very much in the same line as Mr. Gedge and the two succeeding speakers; but as those who have gone before me have said almost the same thing in different words, I may say somewhat the same only in other words. I may say that the committee in choosing the subjects of this conference have acted very wisely in putting down for our consideration the special importance of Sunday-schools and kindred agencies in the present day. Whether we like it or not, I am afraid that the time is coming on—I hope slowly, but I am sure surely—when all religious education of any kind whatsoever which can be called Christian at all will be taken from our day-schools. I hope it may not be in our time, but I believe that is the tendency of the political feeling of the country which is growing up at the present time. I wish Sunday-school teachers to look upon themselves as the catechists for their parish priests. I wish them to teach definite dogmatic Christian truth according to the lines of the Church of England. The catechism was, in former editions of the Prayer-book, part of the confirmation office; and I think the great duty we should set before ourselves as Sunday-school teachers is to prepare the children from the first Sunday on which they come to our schools for their confirmation and for their first communion. We should teach them the great central doctrine of the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ when He came down from Heaven; what He came down for; what He did here; and what He secured for us men; his passion, his death, his resurrection, his ascension, his work now; and the extension of the incarnation in the sacraments of the Church. You have all that in the Church catechism. The Church catechism may be taught to the youngest or the younger children in our Sunday-schools. It is a profound mine of theology for the most advanced student. I know there are Sunday-schools in which a very great deal of scriptural knowledge is taught—scriptural knowledge, for instance about the events of Jeroboam the Second, or the number of years that Abraham lived, or the age at which Abraham died, or the year when Isaac was born. All these things are very useful in their place, but we have not time, between that when children enter our schools and when they are confirmed, before their first communion, to teach such unimportant facts as those. Teach dogmatic Christian truth on the lines of the Church catechism, and bring in all you can adduce from the Old Testament in the way of explanation. I would impress upon all my brother clergy the positive bounden duty incumbent upon them to catechise publicly in their church every Sunday. I was at a large diocesan conference last Monday, and a great many of the clergy there laid very “flattering unction to their souls” because they catechised the first Sunday of every month;—they are ordered both by rubric and canon to do so every Sunday.

REV. CANON GOVER.

THE few remarks I make will be of a very unexciting character. They will be plain hints from a long experience of my own, which began when I was fourteen years of age, was continued through my undergraduateship, when I took the charge of the Sunday-school in a village near Cambridge, and so on, up to the time of my ordination. I hope in these remarks I can neither have my meaning misunderstood, nor any misconception made with regard to them—I will endeavour to make them plain and practical. I want to speak of four points in Sunday-school management. One is with regard to the day-school scholars; the second is as to the older scholars; the third is with regard to the giving of prizes; and the fourth is with respect to promotion in Sunday-schools. First, with regard to the day-school scholars in them. I think you will agree with me that there is a very great difficulty to be fought against in Sunday-schools—their indiscipline; the great difficulty is to get anything like order and discipline in the Sunday-school. Your teachers are not very often capable of obtaining it; and your superintendent whilst in one part of the school cannot keep order in another. If, however, you will take your day-school scholars, and form them into classes separate by themselves, you will find that they have an instinct and habit of discipline acquired at their day-schools. Keep them together. If your Sunday-schools are large, let your scholars which are not in your day-schools be partly on one side and partly on the other, and put your day-schoolers between. The aid to order, and the greater quiet thus produced, will surprise you. Further, as regards these day-school scholars themselves, do not draft them into the other classes when they leave the day-school. Let them retain the spirit of solidarity which community in their day-school has given them before, and then, I think, you will find that you will succeed in keeping them up to the time when they become candidates for confirmation and communion. Next, with regard to the older scholars, two great mistakes are very often made—mixing them up with others without regarding either their acquirements or their ages. No ignorant boy or girl of older years should be placed in a class where he is on a level in education with children much younger than himself. Make a distinct line between your upper and lower classes with respect to age solely; if you can give the older scholars separate class-rooms, so much the better. Do not let them be mixed up at all with your younger classes. Then with regard to those older classes themselves, keep as much as you can the great ignorant lads or girls together, and away from the more advanced. Thirdly, with regard to prizes in Sunday-schools. Prizes in Sunday-schools I hold—I think I am speaking against the authority of a bishop, but am supported by the secretary of the Sunday School Institute, a society whose value in many parishes, however little it may be thought of by some persons, I know and feel—but with regard to these prizes I hold that the Sunday-school is no place for personal rivalry between scholars. Any prize given for religious knowledge is won from the scholars around, and so is utterly destructive of the principle and spirit which should pervade the Sunday-school. Have rewards, if you like, but not prizes. My own plan of giving rewards was this—every class had a certain number of marks, and of a certain value per dozen, which each of the scholars could obtain—their value increasing from the lowest to the highest classes; when a certain number of these marks in any part of the school was gained, the scholar became entitled to a proportionate reward of some book or other. These marks were added up every month, and on the first Sunday of every month the rewards were distributed; and so every child in the school had the opportunity in his turn of getting books, although some would be a

longer and some a shorter time in doing so. Thus there was no personal rivalry engendered by these rewards, either between class and class or between scholar and scholar. The last point is the promotion in classes. You will find after a little time that scholars become a good deal divergent one from the other. Would you move those scholars who show a little more advanced knowledge up to another class? I trow not. That is quite right in a day-school, but it will be fatal in a Sunday-school. The school is to raise the tone and character—moral, religious, and spiritual—of each child there, by the personal example and influence of the teacher who is placed in charge of those scholars. Take, therefore, great care in the examination which you give to each candidate for admission to your Sunday-school before you decide in what class to place him; but having placed him there, let that class work up gradually from stage to stage, as far as possible, under the direction of the same teacher. The longer the scholar gets the personal influence of the individual teacher, the better it will be for the scholar and also for the teacher. But to this end, what we want above all things in our Sunday-schools, are teachers whose personal influence shall be constant; not teachers who will make a bargain with other teachers to come alternate Sunday mornings or afternoons, or once a month, as I have known in some cases; but teachers who will be present, and that punctually, every time their Sunday-school is open.

Rev. H. R. SANDFORD, Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools,
Sheffield.

I HAVE always taken an interest in Sunday-school work ever since I began to teach in a Sunday-school, at the age of sixteen; and at the present time I still carry on a large Bible class entrusted to my care by one of the Sheffield clergy. But, although I have always felt an interest in Sunday-school work, I confess that for many years I have felt inclined to be a reformer in respect of Sunday-schools, in spite of all we have heard of the excellent work that has been done in many of them. Any work that is carried on in the spirit advocated by Canon Stowell and others cannot but have a good effect, yet when we compare the numbers who pass through our Sunday-schools with the very limited numbers who continue to live as attached members of the Church after they reach the age of sixteen, or even with the numbers of working-men and women who attend our churches at all, we must admit that our present Sunday-school work is not so satisfactory in its results as it might and should be. I believe we want some change in our system. I believe that for the sake of the children we really too much sacrifice the education of the young people between the ages of fourteen and twenty. I think we should give far more attention than we do to the education of young persons of that age. We should try and give the afternoon of Sunday at any rate, chiefly to the teaching of such young people. I think it should become a regularly understood thing amongst the young people of our working-classes, that the afternoon of Sunday should be devoted to the instruction of adults rather than of children. Take the case of evening schools: they are always attended by young people of the age that I think it is important to gain hold of, and that is because it is the fashion for young people between fourteen and twenty years of age to attend such evening schools. If the afternoon of Sunday could be given up to such young people instead of to children, we should have an increase in the numbers attending. In districts like Manchester, no doubt, young people long past the age of childhood do come to Sunday-schools; but in the country

districts of Staffordshire, and in the hardware districts of Yorkshire, we do not get them in any great numbers. The morning should be devoted to the teaching of children. I am far from wishing to do away with Sunday-schools for children entirely, as some one advocated; and I should be very sorry that the admirable work done by many people amongst children should be given up: but why not devote the morning to the teaching of the children, and then, in the afternoon, let them have children's services if they want them; but let the great work of the Sunday-school be the teaching of these young people. Again, I think we should get far more adult scholars if we had more separate class-rooms. One of the most satisfactory Sunday-schools in this town is the one connected with the Christian and Educational Institute: it is not a Church institution, I am sorry to say,—but there they do get young men and young women to attend in large numbers on Sundays; and we, too, could I am sure largely increase the number of adults in our schools, if we had similar places in greater numbers. With regard to gaining more educated teachers of the higher class, I do feel that the great thing is for our clergy to teach persons of refinement and culture to feel that their duty is not simply to endeavour to get to Heaven themselves, but that they ought to try and help their brethren to do so.

Rev. J. A. GABRIEL, Diocesan Inspector for the Diocese of Carlisle.

THE last speaker but two sounded a very ominous, if not a doleful and dismal note, when he told us that the time was coming, slowly it might be, but surely, when Bible and all religious teaching would be excluded from our day-schools. I cannot help thinking that the tendency is rather the other way. In proof of this I may say that I inspected a board school only the other day in religious knowledge, and other board schools in the diocese of Carlisle are showing a desire for inspection in religious knowledge.

The point, however, which I wish to bring before you in a few words, concerns a class of lads who are growing into young men, who of course *ought* to go to Sunday-school, but who as a matter of fact do not, and who spend their Sundays idling about the streets, forgetful of God, careless of their destiny, ruining their own souls and all who keep company with them. Can nothing be done for them? You cannot persuade them to attend a Sunday-school with other children. You cannot persuade them to come to anything distinctively religious, but they might be induced to attend a school on Sunday in which reading, and writing, and perhaps other secular subjects should be taught: such school to be held, if possible, at another time, and certainly in another place than the Sunday-school. The introduction of a hymn and closing prayer would do something towards softening the hearts of these lads, and by degrees other things might be worked in, such as Bible-reading books, etc. But the great thing is, that in a school of this kind, you would be appealing to the wants of the lads. You would gain their affections by interesting yourself on their behalf, and the material thus prepared might be worked up in many a useful form.

Besides this, we could add to our list of church-workers a number of persons as teachers, who do not feel themselves qualified for the ordinary kind of Sunday-school teaching, but who would be willing to give an hour on Sundays to such work as I have described.

I know that some will say, "All this might be done on a week-day." Quite true; but the very fact of getting hold of these lads for any purpose on the Sunday

will tend to foster a respect for that day, and to humanize them on that day at least, and that is worth something.

Surely if our Lord Jesus Christ did not hesitate to cure physical suffering on the Sabbath-day, we need not feel any scruples in satisfying some of the wants of these young men, and so to lead them to higher and better things on the Sabbath-day, even though it have the appearance of being "secular." "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath."

Rev. G. S. KARNEY, Vicar of Sandown, Isle of Wight.

WE have heard a great deal about the children of the working-classes. We must not forget the instruction of the children of other classes as well. We must provide for the children of the middle and the upper classes. No clergyman who is experienced in preparing confirmation classes will forget that the children of the working-classes are often better taught than the children of the classes which are supposed to be above them. One good means of doing this is to imitate the Scotch example of having a mixture of social classes in our Sunday-schools, so that the children of different classes might sit together at the same bench, and be taught by the same teacher. This plan has much contributed to make the children of our gentlefolk enjoy the Sabbath day. Another plan which may be adopted in a parish where there are people with leisure time is to have a short week-day service for catechising. We must go further; we must remember that our grown-up friends are often ready to welcome instruction. Is it not often possible to form for them a Bible-class, where they could meet together once a week and have something of the nature of a Bible study upon some portion of the Word of God? Let us always remember, however, that the great aim of all this work is to win hearts to Christ: that by God's grace the love of the Lord Jesus Christ may be manifested in the hearts of those to whom we are speaking. I regret to observe the lax churchmanship of one or two of our speakers this evening. The phrase "the extension of the incarnation in the sacraments" reminds me of a well-known formula in a corrupt continental Church; and being myself a somewhat stiff Churchman of the old evangelical school, I have searched my Prayer-book through and through, but I cannot find the communion table called "God's altar" from the beginning to the end of the book.

Rev. J. DAVENPORT KELLY, Vicar of Christ Church,
Ashton-under-Lyne.

I DESIRE to say a word on behalf of a class of schools not often mentioned in these Church Congresses,—the small schools in rural parishes. We are accustomed to hear of the great schools, where four figures are required for the enumeration of the scholars: but we ought not to forget the difficulties of the little schools in country districts. When I was present last year at the meeting of the Sunday School Institute, I heard the Bishop of Oxford express his sadness at hearing several clergy from the North describe their difficulty in dealing with the great masses of scholars and teachers, a great part of their time and thought being of necessity devoted to the improvement of the organisation; whereas in the country districts of his diocese, the difficulty was to find teachers at all. And the matter has been further impressed on my mind by a remark recently made. I was talking

with a clergyman to-day, and he said: "I have attended one Congress after another; I come from a small country district in a quiet part of England, and I go back having heard of the difficulties of the great schools, but I never hear one word which will give me any assistance as to the work of my own small parish." As my work lies in a large parish in a town, you may ask, what right I have to speak on this subject at all? But, although mine is nominally a town parish, I have in it four Sunday-schools, one of them at least being a rural school in a small hamlet: and further, it has been my lot at different times to have the opportunity of seeing the working of schools of the class to which I refer. What I have first to suggest is, that the clergyman himself will have to do a great deal of the work. Supposing he finds himself in charge of a small school with a scanty population, two duties almost simultaneous will press themselves upon him: first, to undertake a vast amount of teaching in person; and then to pick out the most likely scholars of whom to make a private class to be taught on week-days, and be thus prepared for becoming future teachers. A clergyman who has been many years engaged in such a hamlet informs me that he values very highly a class of this kind, although the best time at which it can be held being in the morning before service, it imposes a considerable additional tax on his strength.

If these scholars are taught in a separate class-room with the utmost care, probably in after days they will be found very valuable as teachers; but for the first part of the time he will be obliged, for the teaching, to depend on himself. And if he require any encouragement or example, I can tell him where to find it, and that is in the Bishop of Manchester, who came to superintend the work of a vast diocese from his small Sunday-school in his Berkshire parish, where, as he told us, he undertook on Sundays the chief part of the teaching. Then the work of catechising will occupy a great portion of the clergyman's time and attention: and in this, the small parish is not without its peculiar advantages. While we in the North feel one great difficulty to be, fairly to distribute the teachers over the Church, as there is barely room for any of the parents, and if we want to get any answers from the children, we have often to move about near them in order to encourage them to speak, in the small rural districts there is a better chance, for the clergyman knowing every one of the children, to elicit answers from them, and to give them instruction. He will also make much of children's services, for which the afternoon is especially appropriate. One thing that is required and, if carried out, will repay his time and attention when the catechising is varied by addresses, is looking out continuous and suitable subjects, such as will occupy them for several Sunday afternoons in succession. This will be more likely to interest them than if every Sunday brought a separate and unconnected topic before them. Suppose, for example, you took the hymn-book in use in your Church, classified the hymns according to subjects or writers, and took pains to explain the meaning of any difficult words and allusions that occurred in them: just as children reading their Bibles have often a dim and indistinct idea of the words which are familiar to us, so you will find that many of the hymns and tunes of the church which they know how to sing, are quite beyond them, so far as the meaning of the words are concerned. Not only in this, but in the ordinary teaching of the school, increased attention should be given to order and method. The clergyman cannot do wrong in expending much of his time in making the instructions he gives or superintends, as systematic as possible. It is sometimes said that in country parishes a temptation exists to grow careless about teaching, because there is a lack of that intelligence which is met with in the children of large town schools. Whether this be the case or not, it does not alter the duty of him who is charged with the oversight of the parish to do his best for the children, and he who devotes what might seem an undue share of his time to the cultivation of the minds of the young in his schools will not fail to see good fruit of his labour.

He will find it at the time of confirmation in the increased number of those who desire to offer themselves, as well as in their greater ability to receive the special teaching he gives: he will see it in the reverence paid to the holy communion, which so often appeals in vain to many of those who once were our scholars: he will—and here I speak from pleasant experience—find amongst them the persons who shall be foremost to help him in some time of sustained effort for the improvement of the masses of our people, as in a parochial mission: and, in less extraordinary times, in the common uneventful life that most lead, he will have around him a body of young people attached to their mother Church by something more than hereditary sentiment, and not likely to be drawn away from her, as is too often the case where the teaching of her principles has been neglected. And I am quite sure that, thus labouring, and devoting to it much time both on Sundays and in the week, he will, though at no slight cost of bodily and mental labour, have reason in a very few years to be thankful for the good result he will see in the improved tone and character of those over whom he has watched, and to whom he will have a right to look for assistance in the support and teaching of his school.

ALBERT HALL, FRIDAY MORNING,

OCTOBER 4th, 1878.

The Right Hon. and Most Rev. the PRESIDENT took the Chair
at 10 A.M.

SPIRITUAL LIFE; ITS HELPS AND HINDRANCES.

The Most Rev. the PRESIDENT.

BEFORE I call upon the first speaker to address you, I desire to express what I believe will be the common wish of all, namely, that during the reading of the present series of papers all manifestations of feeling, and everything that can look like party feeling, should be suppressed in view of the great object we all have, namely, that of edification. We have come here to-day to be brought nearer, if God will, to the very presence of Him and His Son by good words suggested to us out of the Book of Life. I now call upon the Lord Bishop of Rochester to read the first paper.

PAPERS.

The Right Rev. A. W. THOROLD, D.D., Lord Bishop of Rochester.

ETERNAL life is God's own life, in which He has dwelt, willed, and loved from all eternity. This life He purposes for man, and through the Incarnation communicates to him His free and supreme gift to the race. Spiritual life is the expression of theology for what is at the same time the sphere in man, and the function or faculty belonging to him, whereby he receives, assimilates, develops, and matures

this Divine nature and being. Its birth-time is regeneration ; its Creator, the Holy Ghost ; its food, Christ's flesh and blood ; its condition, faith ; its evidence, holiness ; its outcome, the invisible Church. The pattern of its conduct is Christ's human life on earth, in its fellowship and sacrifice. In essential accordance with the character and faculties of the individual, it finds ordained for it, by the wisdom of the Divine Sovereignty its manifold types of existence, modes of expression, measures of force, opportunities of growth. Like all other life, it has its eras and crises and transitions ; yet its youth is not of necessity immature or hysterical, and its riper years must expect no immunity from surprises or decay. Its law is progress ; its liberty, obedience ; its strength, the joy of God ; its wine, hope ; its beauty, meekness. It is at its best when it hungers for God Himself, above and beyond His gifts and His ordinances ; it is most healthy when least self-conscious. Of this spiritual life we are now to consider the helps and hindrances. He who has now the privilege of addressing you on a subject on which his own cherished ideal has ever surpassed, as the heavens are above the earth, the most exceptional moments of his own experience, would not have presumed to speak about it, but for the conviction that God Who graciously teaches us, by our failures as well as by our victories, will lift us up to the peace and light of the region to which I would fain transport you, if we will rest our hearts on His love.

The spiritual life, being God's own life, given to man, and lived in him, according to the laws and possibilities of his being, must be cognate to it in its substance and character.

What is the life of God ? It is a fourfold life—*light, energy, love, righteousness*. "God is light ;" "My Father worketh hitherto : " "God is love ;" "His righteousness reacheth unto the clouds."

And the helps which severally assist us into this life of God are *knowledge*, which is the way to light ; and *work*, to energy ; and *devotion*, to love ; and *discipline*, to righteousness.

Knowledge, I say, is the way into light ; *all* knowledge that is solid, useful, and innocent. For all knowledge, being more or less directly a revelation of God, whether in His attributes or character, just so far as it is apprehended exactly, and imparted conscientiously, is not only of Him but for Him. Even when only secular, its use in the spiritual life is self-evident, since it helps us to equipoise its forces, and to expand them, and to put them to the best use, and thereby protects us from a sour, intellectual narrowness on the one hand, and a too supple emotionalism on the other. In divine things, and especially in that close study of God's Word, both critical and devotional, which is now so perilously neglected by some of us, it helps us to bear witness to men outside, of what God is, as living in and speaking through His children. It might also save some among us whom we honour and love, from casting ashes on their heads, and reproaches on their brethren, for the word of truth, supposed to be lost out of our midst, through widening for them into something of its glorious vastness, the true horizon of the mind of God, and showing them how He is higher than our thoughts,

broader than our creeds, vaster than our plans, and older than our years.

And God is energy—incessant, unwearied, inevitable, beneficent ; and if we would share the fellowship of it we must be at work too. What exercise is to the body, duty is to the spirit ; all duty, whether of this life or the next. Ours is but a single personality ; and in whatever He lays on us to do, God has but one motive, one method. Duty keeps the conscience living and fresh ; goads the sluggish will, shames us out of selfishness, shakes us out of laziness, best of all, compels the discipline of self. But while our earthly duties have their share and influence in our religion, to labour for the Master is every Christian's necessity, refreshment, and safeguard. Christ says to all whom He has redeemed, Witness for me. When the Christian laity of England are constrained by the love of Christ to take this yoke on them, the masses may be won to the Gospel, but not before. And reward will come in their peace as a river, and their righteousness as the waves of the sea. We regular soldiers of the cross do not always discover how a ministry faithfully exercised helps our godliness, till we learn, in the languor of sickness or the painful surprises of holiday time, how the strain of our work keeps us by the river of God.

But God is righteous ; and all righteousness, whether in God or man, is essentially the same : and the one end of the Incarnation, and the Cross, and the Pentecost, and the Intercession in Heaven, is that we should be righteous, even as He is righteous. But discipline is the only road. It was so for Christ, "Who though He were a Son, yet learned obedience through the things which He suffered : " and the disciple is not above his Lord. Discipline for the will through disappointment, and for the affections through bereavement, and for the understanding through difficulties of belief, and for the flesh through sickness and decay. To human eyes, some men are far more sorely tried than others. In the thicket behind some homes the angel of death seems ever to be poising his sharpest arrows. The sad heart asks itself : Is it because I am a sinner above all the Galileans ? If Job's friends do not vex us, often we are Job to ourselves. This, however, is quite certain : Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth : and if the anguish is great, the sweetness of the comfort makes up for it. It is worth a good deal of trouble to learn to feel sin hateful, and to measure the world at its true worth, and for the soul as a weaned child to rest on the bosom of God, to feel Heaven so real and so near, that at once to go there would be like stepping into the next room. As to God—to be taught truly to say, Thou art my portion, is worth the heaped-up sorrows of ten lives. No one can understand the Divine tenderness but those whose souls have been drenched with it. He is so gentle that He is like a mother hanging over us ; so humble, that He patiently waits our time ; so pitiful that He will have us on our own terms ; so filled with kindness, that we seem to hear Him say, "Come as you are—do what you will—say what you feel—only trust Me. This is but one step further towards the ever-nearing welcome in the sinless, tearless shore."

Once more, God is love ; and towards the fuller possession and fruition of Him there is one straight road—the most indispensable and lofty of all—devotion. By devotion I do not simply mean the confession that whispers its guilt, nor praise that murmurs its thanks, nor the petition that urges its necessity, nor the intercession that tenderly wrestles for a brother's need, nor even our supreme and central and all-including blessedness in the communion of His body and blood ; but the adoring and, perhaps, silent fellowship that kneels and muses and wonders, and, looking up at the King's face, catches from it something of its excellent glory, to which God says, " Let me go, for the day breaketh ;" which humbly replies to Him, " Whom have I in heaven but Thee ?" Other things are good and useful ; one is vital—communion with God. My friends, the Church as well as the world is growing too busy to pray. Do not tumble into that snare, or your spiritual life will not be worth a year's purchase. What we want we ask for, and what we ask for we get ; no more. Our Saviour's company may be worth much or little ; this is certain, and it touches the entire area of our spiritual life, that it is not won in a day, nor do a week's prayers climb its Pisgah. The spiritual life of which we speak is like some vast elevated table-land, which we do not reach by beholding it from afar, nor climb by feebly wishing we were there, nor win by a single sword thrust, nor ripen by a year's sorrow. God slowly and painfully educates His elect for their long immortality ; but—

" When the shore is won at last,
Who will count the billows past ?"

We have also to consider the hindrances to the spiritual life ; and out of them, time permits me to indicate but three—*Religious egotism, an unwise indulgence in means of grace, and spiritual pride.*

In the spiritual life both the objective and subjective elements claim recognition ; and a characteristic preponderance of one over the other must, within due limits, be expected and allowed. But let us beware how we encourage a want of symmetry and proportion between one feature and the other. Of course conscious union with God lies at the very root of personal religion ; yet if there is too much introspection in it, too much comparison of yesterday's feelings with to-day's, too jealous a criticism of motives, too keen a sensitiveness about tiny faults, what will happen ? Our own holiness will insensibly be taking the place of Christ's righteousness. His precious blood will presently lose its power in healing the wounds of sin ; our whole moral nature will become flabby and nerveless ; we shall lose our tight grip of those grand central facts and verities which, like a great mountain range, are guides to the pilgrim, shadows from the heat and the blasts, cisterns of living water to make glad the City of God. Not what I think of God, but what God is in Himself, is the truth that saves me. Not what I feel to God, but what God feels to me, is the charter of my salvation and my hope. To know and believe the love God hath to us, and in the strength of that meat to go on day by day till we see Him, this is the faith of men.

But in vital connection with this is another peril, against which I would utter a very gentle but a most distinct caution: gentle, since the danger has a very blessed side to it, and some of us may envy it; distinct, because, just through its blessedness, it may fail to be seen. Ours are eminently emotional times, of daily Communion, frequent spiritual retirements, personal intercourse with religious advisers of the most unreserved character—in a word, forgive the expression, of incessant spiritual luxuries, of which our fathers and their fathers never dreamed, but without which they still contrived both to do and to suffer a good deal for Christ.

Let us judge no man. Let us not presume to force our own standard of what is good for ourselves on the conscience of our brethren. We are all free, and we will hold fast our freedom.

Still I caution. Let us be specially on our guard against whatever may tend to make us put the ordinances of Christ in the place of Christ, or so to treat and regard those ordinances as if they were the inevitable and necessary conduits of His grace, which may not be had without them. Christ and Christ alone is the food of the soul. He has been pleased to appoint these ordinances as channels to convey Himself to us: but He is not bound to them, nor confined by them. Sometimes He has to vindicate His own honour, by leaving His people in the wilderness till they come back straight to Him for Himself. The soul pampered with unwise provision has a sad but needful famine, when circumstances deprive it of its cherished ministries. Some stand the test, but you may count them on your fingers. Others, who have over-stimulated their life by living on cordials, find it at first a weary and thankless journey back to Jacob's well, where the stranger Jesus patiently waits for them, once more to give them with His own hands of the water of life.

Lastly, I would speak of spiritual pride in its two chief forms of isolation and self-conceit. Isolation—in the undervaluing of the fellowship of Christ's body, either in a chilly unsociableness or a dread of infection—must tell, and more seriously than we suspect, on the vigour and fruitfulness of the soul. Some sorts of *αυταρξεια* are fatal. They mean the loss of that vital spiritual heat which is generated by the assemblies of the faithful—of that wide and instructive interchange of thought and experience, whereby prejudice comes to be corrected, ignorance remedied, duty suggested, sympathy stirred—of that opportunity of passing on to others what we humbly believe our Master has intrusted to us—of that wholesome discipline of natural, yet dangerous self-love, which, whether in the idolatry of our own opinions or in our sturdy dislike of other men's works, lie like dry-rot on the Church of God. Yet “no man liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself;” and if we try to reverse God's Word in Paradise, “It is not good for man to be alone,” we must take the consequences, and they are serious. From spiritual pride who here shall dare to say, I am free? All of us are tempted in turn to be intolerant of other men's methods, over critical of eccentric types of goodness, doubtful about unfamiliar formulas, ready to look coldly askance at a liberty which we deny ourselves, merely because it would hurt *us*; almost to refuse credence to a life that seems to

grow in another zone. But let us be humble and full of charity. Nothing is so saintly as humbleness, nothing so wise as charity. God fulfils himself in many ways. Outward circumstances, difficult functions of life, the burden of secular cares must modify the outward features of religion, and often make it tenfold harder than we suspect. No doubt, as St. Paul says, a spiritual man has a right to judge, while he himself is judged of no man. But weigh in the scales of God.

Above everything, never suffer your spiritual religion, either in the language that professes it, or the features that indicate it, to outstrip your moral life. As much for your own sake as other men's—more swiftly and surely than the deadly dews of the Panama swamps on the European traveller, will the faintest mildew of insincerity poison the springs of your soul. As for society—and you have to be the salt of society—it does not forbid or even dislike spiritual life among spiritual people. It expects it, and in a way admires it. But it is very uncompromising in exacting consistency; it will have reality, and it is right; and with the sharpest of needles it pricks the tumour of religious pride. If men live in the clouds they should be like the angels, and if, with our lofty profession, and great aims, and frequent exercises there be found side by side small infirmities, hard resentments, insufficient self-control, palpable self-indulgence, a household not ordered for God, and a daily life without the true mint mark on it, the sermons in which we bid men to be holy will sound but as the turgid phrases of a professional sanctity: he who bids his neighbour carry his cross, but shirks his own, has no quarter from the world.

To be *in* Christ is the secret of our life; to be *for* Christ the end of our activities; to be *with* Christ the hope of our glory; to be all this *together* the invincible link of our blessed concord. But a little while, and perhaps sooner than we think of, the curtain will lift, and we one by one shall go in to see the King. Then, but not till then, our robes of whiteness will have no soil on them. Then, and assuredly then, we shall see His face and be like Him, and be satisfied.

REV. CANON BLAKENEY, M.A., Vicar of Sheffield.

“I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life.”

SPIRITUAL life is life created in the spirit of man by the Holy Spirit. “The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus,” saith the Apostle, “hath made me free from the law of sin and death.” (Rom. viii. 2.)

The Holy Spirit graciously acts upon the spirit of man, that highest portion of his tripartite nature. The Apostle speaks of spirit, soul, and body (πνεῦμα, ψυχή, σῶμα) (1 Thes. v. 23), and

prays that they may be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Alford observes that τὸ πνεῦμα is the spirit, the highest and distinctive part of man, the immortal and responsible soul in our common parlance: ἡ ψυχὴ is the lower or animal soul containing the passions and desires which we have in common with the brute, but which in us is ennobled and drawn up by the πνεῦμα.

The same Apostle in 1 Cor. ii. refers to the natural or carnal man, ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος, and distinguishes him from the spiritual man, πνευματικός. In the natural or carnal man the ψυχὴ predominates, and the spirit is overborne and lifeless. In the spiritual man the πνεῦμα rules and the ψυχὴ is kept in restraint.

Tertullian, in his treatise "of fasting," designates his opponents as *psychics*. He was a Montanist at the time, and because the orthodox objected to his rigorous views as to fasting, he denounced them as psychics.

Spiritual life is given when the Holy Ghost calls the spirit of man into action as a controlling power. The Sanctifier vivifies the human spirit, sets it free from the bondage of the lower nature, and establishes that law or rule in man which is life and peace. Then the whole man—spirit, soul, and body—is consecrated to the divine service. But this life or new creation is not without its difficulties: it has its hindrances.

Of these, the Apostle refers to the flesh as the foremost. "The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh." (Gal. v. 17.) "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts." (Gal. v. 24.)

The passions and desires of the lower nature rise up against the spirit, and attempt to assume the mastery, but the spiritual man "walking in the spirit," according to its dictates, fulfils not the lusts of the flesh. The mind of the spirit, or the spiritual mind, yields not to the mind of the flesh or the carnal mind; the φρόνημα σαρκὸς which, as it is stated in our ninth Article, remains even in the regenerate.

The spirit quickened by the Holy Ghost maintains the mastery, and if the Christian fall it is by the efforts of the rebel within.

But there are hindrances without, namely, the world, and the devil who is described as the "god of this world." These hindrances are referred to by the Saviour in the parable of the sower as "the cares, and riches, and pleasures of this life," which choke the word and it becometh unprofitable. (Luke viii. 14.)

Satan, too, is not only "a roaring lion," but "an angel of light." (2 Cor. xi. 14.) I would notice especially the hindrances which are occasioned by the inconsistencies of those who profess to know God, whether amongst the clergy or laity, and which have existed in every age of the Church. These things, inconsistencies of temper and tongue, exercise a chilling influence upon the divine life, and are rocks of offence to many.

And now as to the helps.

1. First is the promised and essential aid of the Holy Ghost. It is to this especially that the Apostle refers when he says:—"But if

ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." (Rom. viii. 13.) "This I say, then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh." (Gal. v. 16.) To "walk in the Spirit" is to submit to His blessed influences, and to live in accordance with His guidance. The first fruit of the Spirit is "love," and then follow "joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." (Gal. v. 22, 23.)

"Walk in love," saith the Apostle, (Eph. v. 2,) and this follows the exhortation, "Be ye, therefore, followers or imitators of God, as dear children." "God is love." (1 John, iv. 8.) "He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him." (1 John iv. 16.)

Love is the very essence of the divine life, and the more we grow in love the greater is our advance. The spirit of hatred is a main hindrance to the spiritual life; the cultivation of the spirit of love is a main help.

2. The prayerful study of the Holy Scriptures is the divinely appointed help to spiritual life.

It is remarkable that our Book of Homilies opens with the Homily, "A fruitful exhortation to the reading and knowledge of Holy Scripture." "These books," says the Homily, "ought to be much more in our hands, in our eyes, in our ears, in our mouths, but most of all in our hearts, for the Scripture of God is the heavenly meat of our souls." "And there is nothing," says the same Homily, "that so much strengtheneth our faith and trust in God, that so much keepeth up innocency and pureness of the heart, and also of outward godly life and conversation as continual reading and recording of God's word."

But we must ever remember that the bare reading of the Word without prayerful meditation is of little avail. Therefore our Church says that Scripture should be not only "much in our hands," but "in our hearts." How fully is this truth recognised in the collect for the second Sunday in Advent, and other portions of our Liturgy: "Blessed Lord, who hast caused all Holy Scriptures to be written for our learning; grant that we may in such wise hear them, read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest them, that by patience and comfort of thy Holy Word, we may embrace, and ever hold fast the blessed hope of everlasting life, which thou hast given us in our Saviour Jesus Christ."

3. Besides the Holy Scriptures, there are other divinely appointed means of grace—public worship, the Holy Communion, and private prayer.

Our Church speaks of three kinds of prayer—mental, vocal, and common. The Homily, having quoted examples and shown the value of public worship, says,—"Therefore, I beseech you, let us no longer be negligent on this behalf, but as the people willing to receive at God's hands such things as in the Common Prayer of the Church are craved; let us join ourselves together in the place of Common Prayer, and with one voice and one heart beg at our heavenly Father's hands all those things which He knoweth to be necessary for us." (An Homily on Common Prayer and the Sacraments.)

The Homily of "the worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ," sets forth the nature and benefits of the Lord's Supper, "which," says the Homily, "although it seem of small virtue to some, yet being rightly done by the faithful, it does not only help their weakness, who by their poisoned nature are readier to remember injuries than benefits,—but strengtheneth and comforteth their inward man with peace and gladness, and maketh them thankful to their Redeemer with diligent care and godly conversation." The Post Communion Rubric says that we kneel at the Lord's table, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of "THE BENEFITS OF CHRIST therein given to all worthy receivers."

Mental prayer, as our Church says, "is the devout lifting up of the mind to God, without the uttering of the heart's grief or desire by open voice, . . . after this sort must all Christians pray, not once in a week, or once in a day only, but, as St. Paul writes to the Thessalonians, 'without ceasing.'"

Of private vocal prayer, the Homily says that it is "the secret uttering of the griefs and desires of the heart with words."

Such prayer is one of the means by which we may repel the temptations of the wicked one.

Bishop Hall, referring to evil thoughts, and the sudden temptations of the devil, says, "Whensoever you shall be thus troubled, do you by a sudden ejaculation raise up your heart to God, and beseech Him to rebuke that evil one; and do not care so much to answer the temptation as to implore the aid of Him who can take off the tempter at pleasure, who hath a hook in the nostrils of that Leviathan." (Epist. lix.)

Self-examination is enjoined in the Catechism and in the Exhortation to the Communion.

Meditation is the accompaniment of self-examination, and, with this view, it is well occasionally to commune with oneself in private. But let us ever remember that no privacy can withdraw us from the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil.

Jerome says that in the solitude of the desert he fancied that "he was in the midst of the enjoyments of Rome." (Letter Eugubium.) I refrain from quoting his painful confessions.

Bishop Hall remarks that some have fled to deserts, "and, lest their enemy might insinuate himself into their secresy, have abridged themselves of diet, clothing, lodging, harbour fit for reasonable creatures; seeming to have left off themselves no less than companions. As if the world were not everywhere; as if we could hide ourselves from the devil; as if solitariness were privileged from temptation; as if we did not more violently affect restrained delights; as if those Jeromes did not find Rome in their hearts when they had nothing but rocks and trees in their eye * * * * in vain is the body an anchorite if the heart be a ruffian; and if that be re-tired in afflictions, the body is but a cypher; so then the eyes will look carelessly and strangely on what they see." (Epistle xxviii.)

The knowledge of human nature—of human nature in ourselves—its weaknesses and corruptions, not only leads us to avoid danger,

but to view rightly the inconsistencies of others. "If a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted." (Gal. vi. 1). The ungodly rejoice, and the weak Christian stumbles at the manifestations of the fleshly nature in the followers of Christ.

When we are weak, that is when we know our own imperfections, then are we strong; we look up for aid to "the Lord of all power and might," and we, though compassed about by a great cloud of witnesses, are led in running the race to look above all "unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith" (Heb. xii. 1), who hath left us an example that we should follow His steps. (1 Peter ii. 21.) "Cease ye from man whose breath is in his nostrils, for wherein is he to be accounted of." *Sursum Corda*, lift up your hearts unto the Lord.

4. Further, I believe that active service in the cause of Christ is a most effectual help in the divine life.

To everyone some talent is given with the exhortation, "occupy till I come." The charge applies to laity as well as to clergy,—each one can find a sphere of duty suitable to his case. O, how much is implied in the words, "pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." (James i. 27.)

Sympathy with the afflicted and purity of life are results of true religion. Let us go out into the lanes and courts, into the highways and byways, and work for Christ. Many lessons are to be learned in the homes of the sick and needy. The sight of suffering humanity brings down our high thoughts. Let us follow the example of our Master, who went about doing good, and we shall enjoy a rich blessing on our own souls.

"Go, labour on; spend, and be spent,
Thy joy to do thy Father's will;
It is the way the Master went:
Should not the servant tread it still?"

Rev. Canon WILLIAM WALSHAM HOW, Rector of Whittington,
Shropshire.

THE spiritual life is not much easier to define than the natural life. Each is a mystery. Of each we know little except its energies. Of the essence of the spiritual life we can say little more than that it is the life of God in the soul, a presence and a power, supernatural, divine. It is wrought in us by the Holy Spirit, the "Giver of life," and shares in that Holy Spirit's nature, for, like the wind, it is invisible, yet known by the evidences of its secret power.

Growth is a necessity of the spiritual life. The work of sanctification, which is the growth of the spiritual life, is progressive. That

life is ever being conformed more and more to the great pattern Life. If it be healthy, it is a steady growth in grace.

In this progressive work there are many helps and hindrances. I would rather speak of the hindrances first. Among the greater and more obvious of these is *indecision*—the want of entire self-surrender to God. This is often the secret cause of a great deal that is very unsatisfactory and disappointing. You will see persons who have much that is generous and hopeful in them, who have given fair promise, and entertained high aims, nevertheless failing in the critical moment, drawing back from burdensome or unwelcome duties, uncertain in action, unequal in spirits, incapable of long-sustained endeavour, complaining of hardness, irresolute, fickle, procrastinating. We wonder what it is that is wrong with them. Plainly, there is something sadly marring and hindering the brightness and freedom of the spiritual life. Is it not very often just that *they have kept back part of the price*? They profess to have given themselves to God, to have laid on his altar the full cost of their self-surrender; but they have never made the sacrifice complete. Only half their hearts (and is it always half?) is given to God, and then it is little wonder if they are only half-hearted in God's service. Even if it be only one little corner of the heart which has been kept back for self it is enough to account for a whole world of failure and inconsistencies. The spiritual life will never be healthy, and vigorous, and happy, until all—body, soul, and spirit, will and affections, time and talents, little things and great, the whole life and the whole being, belong, and consciously belong, to God. "Thou hast made me for Thyself," says St. Augustine, "and my heart knoweth no rest until it attains to Thee."

The second hindrance I would mention is *sloth*. I do not mean outward inactivity, indolent and self-indulgent habits of life; but something more subtle, and perhaps, therefore, more dangerous. I speak of spiritual sloth—that indolence in spiritual things which is perfectly compatible with great outward activity. Indeed, there seems a singular tendency to this hindrance in persons of very active and energetic natures. Look at some busy, eager worker, full of schemes of usefulness, never content to be idle, prodigal in labours. You would never think of sloth in connection with him. Yet, if you could get below the surface, and peer into the hidden mysteries of his inner life, it may be you would be startled to find how utterly sloth is ruining all the healthfulness of its growth, and clogging all the free play of its energies. What is this dreary lassitude in devotion? What this very posture, provocative rather of sleep than of prayer? What this spiritual slovenliness, which looks as if he thought anything would do for God? What this shrinking from all real self-denials and unwelcome spiritual exercises? It is sloth which loves what is easy and hates what is laborious. His outward activity is easy. He would not be happy to be idle. His secret devotions, his self-denials, and self-discipline, are difficult. Therefore the one is done, and the other left undone, or done in sadly meagre fashion. And where this sloth creeps over the spiritual life it never can grow and prosper.

I may mention next a very frequent hindrance of a very opposite sort—namely, *distraction of mind*. In these busy, hurrying days, when almost all work has to be done at high pressure, this is a very great hindrance. The mind becomes like some inn crowded with visitors, and where there is a constant coming and going of new guests, so that there is no room for the one great Guest. Of course this is a special hindrance to certain temperaments. If it is hard to believe the active, energetic worker a prey to sloth, plainly it is not hard to believe him a prey to distraction. He may never wilfully, scarcely ever consciously, suffer really sinful thoughts to rest in his mind, yet the multiplicity of things to be done, and read, and thought about, and attended to, is so absorbing that it is all but impossible to escape from them or banish them, even for a few minutes at a time. Who knows not how all his plans, and business, and engagements, great and small, come trooping through his mind's passages just when he would seize a quarter of an hour for prayer or meditation? These wandering thoughts, what a trial they are to all who really want to pray better! I suppose this hindrance is a very hard one to overcome. Yet it can be lessened by God's grace. It is quite certain, for instance, that for many, prayer and meditation are found to be much easier in the early morning, before the busy cares, and manifold interests, and trivial occupations of the day have had time to claim their accustomed place. And we can practise concentrating the mind upon whatever we take in hand, learning the habit of bending the attention by an act of will upon one thing at a time. My own experience teaches me to hold that the daily prayer of the Church is a most valuable discipline in concentration of mind, and very helpful as counteracting the distraction of a busy life.

I will mention only one more hindrance to the spiritual life—a *controversial spirit*. Controversy is a necessity, and we dare not cease to contend for truth. To condemn and abjure all controversy would be treason to the God of truth, and would often imperil the truth itself. Moreover, truth is changeless, definite, distinct; not variable, not undefined, not hazy. God forbid I should plead for indifference to truth! But, while controversy is a necessity, the controversial spirit, which need not of necessity accompany it, is a very fatal hindrance to the healthiness of the spiritual life. Few things are more destructive of love, and love is of the very essence of the spiritual life. It makes one almost ashamed of religion itself to hear or read the bitter, contemptuous, uncharitable language with which men professing to be zealous for religion will speak of those from whom they differ, or who belong to an opposite Church party. I think there is some sort of an excuse for the *odium theologicum*: I always hope its rancour may be a gauge of the force of conviction in the mind of the disputant and of the earnestness with which the opinion contended for is valued. But I am none the less sure that controversial bitterness is a sin, and that sneers and ridicule are weapons which wound the wielder more deeply than his opponent. "Speaking the truth in love" is the only Christian way of speaking it at all. A generous readiness to see the best in others, and to under-

stand and sympathise with their views and position, is the only way to rob controversy of its deadening power. But, after all, it is only the few who, by their position or by their special gifts, are called to take part in controversy. And to the rest I would say, Avoid it, if you would love your neighbour; avoid it, if you would escape from the snare of pride and uncharitableness; avoid it, if you would have "that mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus."

I must now turn from hindrances to helps. And, as I put indecision—the want of entire self-surrender to God—first among the hindrances, so I will put its opposite first among the helps which I wish to name. Nothing will so foster and invigorate the spiritual life as *thoroughness of self-surrender to God*. If the spiritual life be the life of God in the soul, it is plain that that life cannot be free to develop itself, and to become what God would have it be, until the whole inner being is given to Him. It is this which alone will give freedom, consistency, evenness, and peace to the life. Once let the will be one with God's will; once let self be nothing and God all in all; and we have gained the secret of a holy and a happy life. It is the kicking of our lower nature against this absolute surrender of self to God, which is the secret of all unholiness and unhappiness in those who are making some efforts to serve God. Let this self-dedication be renewed again and again. It is renewed whensoever we offer and present unto God ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Him. Let it be repeated, if you will, day by day, till it grows into an abiding habit and posture of soul—till the one thought which governs the whole life and the whole man is simply this—I am not my own, but His.

Among the less obvious helps to the spiritual life I am disposed to rank highly that of *religious friendship*. It is hard for most to stand alone. We all crave sympathy and the encouragement of companionship. I do not mean merely that we should choose religious persons for our friends, though that is obvious enough; but I mean that we should select some one other person like-minded with ourselves, and should make a compact of mutual help with that person. I suppose it is not every one who would have the opportunity of this help; but I have known young men help each other greatly by mutual confidence in religious matters; I have known young girls agree together to tell each other whenever either saw anything wrong in the other; I have known three or four ladies to find the greatest blessing in reading the Bible together and speaking to each other quite openly on their personal religion. We English are very shy, and it needs a considerable effort to overcome this shyness so far as to adopt such a plan; but it is well worth trying, and it will be found that God's people are not a little strengthened and encouraged by speaking often one to another of the things of God.

But while there are many helps to the spiritual life, and some of these have been already touched upon by others, I am constrained to say one thing. No methods, no means of grace, no rules of holy living, no escape from special hindrances, will avail while there is lacking the brightness and the power of a true and living *faith*. The spiritual life, like some delicate Alpine plant, needs not only a

generous soil, but also a pure atmosphere. It thrives in the sunshine. It will not grow in a dark room. I am sure that in many Christians the spiritual life is sadly dwarfed and stunted for want of warmth, and light, and fresh air. There is little realisation of the fatherly love of God, and so there is little freedom. There is little realisation of the infinite mercy of the Saviour, and so there is little joy and peace in believing. There is much introspection, but little faith. Men keep gazing on the festering wounds when they should be looking up to the Brazen Serpent. It is partly the spirit of the age. It is the tendency of the age to examine everything minutely, searchingly; and, not least, the secrets of our own inner being. Perhaps this is not altogether amiss: yet if this tendency be not balanced by a faith which can look straight away from self to God, it is manifest that there is a danger of darkness and despondency. We want a more abiding consciousness of God's presence and of His love. And this is cherished and strengthened best by the habit of ejaculatory prayer and praise. The habit of frequent liftings up of the heart to God, of consecrating all our daily duties and cares, and not less all our daily pleasures, by secret reference to Him—this will make His presence a familiar thought to us. It is, in short, the natural utterance of faith, and by it faith grows. Other helps will follow in the wake of this. A living faith will embrace faithful and blessed use of all means of grace; it is the life and the strength of prayer; the secret and key of sacramental blessing. So in a brief sketch like this, of the helps to the spiritual life, I care not to particularise many lesser things, but would rather point out that without which these have no power or blessedness. Where the eternal verities of the unseen world are realised, the spiritual life will grow and thrive. Would we have it healthy and fruitful? Then let the love of God pour round about it its warmth and glow; let the Sun of righteousness shine upon it with bright rays of living light; let the dew of the Spirit nourish and refresh it. In a word, if we would indeed find a help to the spiritual life, we have only more and more to make it a life "hid with Christ in God."

Rev. E. H. BICKERSTETH, Vicar of Christ Church, Hampstead.

SPIRITUAL life, what is it? All life is a mystery. It would baffle the scientific skill of mankind to make the meanest insect which flutters through its little day of animated existence, or the humblest plant whose seed is in itself upon the earth. We have no reason to suppose that the loftiest archangel can himself create even the lowliest living organism. All creation looks up with unwearied gaze, and confesses to her God, "With Thee is the fountain of life: in Thee we live, and move, and have our being."

But is there an impenetrable veil spread over the source and sustentation of all life, even the feeblest and most fugitive, how much more over that highest conceivable vitality which we call spiritual life? It is of all human mysteries the most profound.

Like the love which quickens and supports it, it passes knowledge. It is an effluence from the essential life of God. It is the breath of the Holy Ghost in the heart of man. It is Christ living in us, the hope of glory.

Now, much has been said well and wisely in this and former Congresses on the means God has vouchsafed to his Church for deepening and strengthening that life in his people, by which He is pleased to act on the world. The promised supply is at hand, and ready for our use. Our sufficiency is of God; and nothing else would suffice us; for our needs are pressing and immediate, the claims are urgent, the conflict is upon us. We cannot afford to wait. The word must often be spoken and the duty done at the call of the moment, or the golden opportunity is lost for ever. We absolutely want grace in our time of need, and that time is *now*.

Thank God, that needful present grace is ours in Christ. We have the footstool of a Father's throne, at which we kneel accepted suppliants hour by hour; we have a High Priest who is with us all the days to the end of the world. We have the promised Comforter, who abides with us for ever. We have the holy communion of saints in the Church of Christ, and all the manifold means of refreshment which God has provided for us on our pilgrim way. The Great Householder has with divine forecast prepared amply and abundantly for his servants during his absence, and meanwhile we may sing, and, God helping us, will ever sing with David and with Paul, "Blessed be the Lord who daily loadeth us with benefits. Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ."

But this does not embrace the whole provision made for our spiritual training and education. We are being taught and disciplined for eternity; we are heirs of an everlasting kingdom, and are children of a Father who hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light; and it is not worthy of our heavenly calling that our thoughts, and desires, and joys should be bounded only by our daily needs and their daily supply, even although these needs concern our immortal souls as well as our mortal bodies, and that supply comes from the ever-living God. We must not only look inward and upward, but onward; not only inward into our own mysterious spiritual being, not only upward to the God and Father of our spirits, but onward to the glory which shall be revealed. It does not beseem the dignity of those who are heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ, to be absorbed in "this present," however noble and lofty its responsibilities may be. We shall see greater things than these. "Our life is hid with Christ in God." But it will not always be so. "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall we also appear with Him in glory." Now this utterance of the Spirit affords a clue to one of the truest helps and unmaskers one of the greatest hindrances of spiritual life. That life is of divine origin, but it labours here under immense disadvantages. It is like a bulb which has not yet pierced the soil; it is pressing towards the air and light. But what if it cease to struggle upward? What

if some ungenial clay hinder or some massive stone repel? It is the temporary frustration, if not the partial paralysis of life.

Our highest privilege is this, "We have the mind of Christ." But He is Himself expecting until his enemies be made his footstool. There is a peculiar emphasis laid on this fact in the oracles of God. First revealed to the sweet Psalmist of Israel in words of fathomless depth—"The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool;" it is enshrined no less than seven times in the New Testament—by the three synoptic evangelists, in St. Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost, by St. Paul in his great argument for the resurrection, and twice in the Epistle to the Hebrews. There is no precipitance with God. St. Paul prays for the Thessalonians, "The Lord direct your heart into God's love and into Christ's patience." As St. Augustine says, "*Æternus est, tardat, longanimis est.*" And perhaps when the day breaks and the shadows flee away, it will be found that the present season of the Church's vigil and warfare is the grandest example of the patience of Jesus Christ. It was the endurance of Him whose years fail not, which waited until the earth was prepared for the creation of man during periods probably immeasurable to our arithmetic. It was a wonderful forbearance which bore with man's sin during the long ages that intervened betwixt the Fall and the first Advent. Nothing less than the long suffering of Emmanuel could have sustained the contradiction of sinners in the days of his flesh. But you know when the struggle is over and the victory won, how *we* the more eagerly snatch the prize.

Now the prize which the Lord Jesus set before Himself was the accomplishment of his Father's will in the presentation of his Bride in glory. For this He gave Himself for her; Christ gave Himself for the Church that He might present her to Himself in glorious beauty. And the crisis of the conflict was around the blood-stained cross and the open sepulchre. But He did not grasp at the fruits of victory. Calmly and deliberately, in the profound repose of infinite wisdom and power, He has been awaiting now for nearly 2,000 years the slow development of his great counsels of love. The results have often been, to the impatient eye of man, so incommensurate with the death and resurrection and ascension of the Incarnate Son of God, that the Church militant here on earth has been sick at heart and ready to faint, and her children have often asked themselves in amaze, Can it be that all these centuries have passed since the Lord taught us to pray, "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as in heaven"—and, alas! his kingdom is not yet come, and his will is still resisted by ten thousand times ten thousand rebellious hearts?

Such is the trial of the faith of the Church. But meanwhile the Master has been working all things after the counsel of his own will.

"No eye but His might ever bear
To gaze all down that drear abyss,
Because none ever saw so clear
The shore beyond of endless bliss."

He, the Son of Man, has still moved unperturbed amid the seven

golden candlesticks, observing when the flame burned dimly, and supplying the secret oil to every humble and contrite heart. He, the good Shepherd, has tended his flock, with unsleeping eye, and led his sheep to the green pastures, and gathered the lambs in his arms and carried them in his bosom. He, the great Husbandman, has watched every leaf, and tendril, and blossom, and ripening cluster of the mystic vine.

But has his ultimate design been for a moment absent from the mind of our Advocate, who prayed, "Father, I will that those whom Thou hast given Me, be with Me where I am, that they may behold My glory?" I trow not. He came to do his Father's will; and that will is, that of all given to Him He should lose nothing, but raise it up at the last day. For this final triumph He, the Heir of all things, is waiting and working. Nor will He rest until his latest promise to the seventh Church is fulfilled, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with Me on My throne, even as I also overcame, and now sit down with My Father on his throne."

Now only as our heart beats truly with Christ's heart, only as our innermost and most real desires are in unison with his, can we live that spiritual life which to live is Christ.

Our Lord's earthly life was lived and his ministry fulfilled in the light of his return to judgment. In his sermon on the mount, in his charge to the apostles, in his private discourses, in his most impressive parables, in his promises of reward, in his farewell converse after the holy supper, in his good confession before the Sanhedrim, He pointed on to *THAT DAY*. And after his ascension, this promise of his return was the consolation which angels poured into the bereaved hearts of his disciples. This nerved them to preach to Israel, and this crowned the testimony of Paul at Athens. In the epistles it runs as a golden thread through all. St. Paul never wearies of it. From his earliest to the Thessalonians, where it shines in almost every paragraph, to his latest pastoral epistles, it is still the epiphany of the glory of our great God and Saviour, which is the blessed hope of the Church, and of himself as he looked on to that crown which the Lord should give him, and not him only, but all those who love his appearing. St. James urges patience, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh. St. Peter fulfils, and hands on his own solemn charge, reminding the elders of the advent of the chief Shepherd. St. John comforts those whom the world knew not, by the assurance, "When He shall appear we shall be like Him for we shall see Him as He is." St. Jude re-echoes Enoch's warning, "The Lord cometh." And the last book of the inspired canon bears on its fore-front "Behold He cometh with clouds," portrays the advent itself in the grandest imagery, and closes with the threefold watchword, "I come quickly."

As we drink into the spirit of these Scriptures we are tempted to say, There will not be one laggard heart: all will watch and wait and long for the return of their absent Lord. But has it been so?

This truth held indeed a prominent place in the teachings and in such writings as have come down to us of the apostolic fathers. The Church, purified by persecution, craved for her Lord. And when

Constantine planted Christianity upon the throne of the Cæsars many thought that the kingdom of Christ had begun. And there have been periods of revived expectancy—as at the close of the first thousand years from the birth of Christ, and at the blessed Reformation, and partially in our own days.

But, looking broadly over the Church of God, have the servants of the Householder been watching for his return? Or has it not rather been as in the parable of the virgins, that while the bridegroom tarried they all slumbered and slept?

I would not forget the power of the prayer rising daily from countless hearts, "Thy kingdom come." I would not hide from myself the patient protest of our creeds, "He shall come to judge the quick and the dead." I do thank God that in the season of Advent we not only look backward to Bethlehem, but onward to Olivet. And above all I would remember that in the supper of the Lord we do continually shew forth his death till He comes.

Still, can you say the Church of Christ is watching? You go from congregation to congregation, from city to city, from land to land, what a subordinate place the second advent seems to hold in the minds of Christians! You attend missionary meetings, ruridecanal gatherings, conferences, congresses, synods—all needful and helpful in their place to the growth of Church life; you join in retreats of the clergy, and quiet days of communicants for retirement and prayer—those admirable means of grace which, when kept free from Romish error, are doing so much to revive the true spiritual life of pastors and people;—nay, you share the closest converse which friend has with friend on the things of God; and in all how seldom you catch the echo of the Master's watchword, "Surely I come quickly."

Why is this? Partly, I think, from the gloom with which the Church of Christ, when she left her first love, invested the second Advent. The hymn, *Dies iræ*, was the very outcome of mediæval faith. I do not deny that its awful terror is one true aspect of the day of the Lord, and finds its warrant in Scripture:

"Ah, that day of tears and mourning,
From the dust of earth returning:
Man for judgment must prepare him,
Spare, O God, in mercy spare him."

But it is one aspect only. There is another: "When these things begin to come to pass, then look up and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh." And the human heart instinctively turns from gloom, and turns to joy.

Then another cause which has repelled not a few from the study of prophecy has been the apparently hopeless conflict of rival interpretations and the rashness of some expositors, who have ventured to assign a near date for the Advent, a presumption which time has again and again rebuked.

Another reason has, doubtless, been the silent reflex influence of those students of natural phenomena who claim for law a power superior to that of the lawgiver who enacts it. They argue with such a show of reason, "All things continue as they were from the

foundation of the world;" and that what has been shall be. The Advent would so confuse and subvert a thousand favourite theories that it is no wonder learned men, who have not learned Christ, put the thought from them.

But the main cause is, I suspect, broader and more universal still: I mean the immense power of things seen and temporal—that of which our Lord warns even apostles—"Take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares; for as a snare shall it come upon all them that dwell upon the face of the whole earth." We must not confine the warning to physical excess, or voluptuousness in eating or drinking; it has evidently a deeper meaning. There is a cloying of the powers of the immortal soul by feeding too freely on the things of the world, and drinking too deeply into its spirit. There is an intellectual surfeit. There is a spiritual inebriation. And after the discussion of yesterday morning on theatrical amusements, may I not ask in passing,—would a half purified drama (and wholly purified all experience proves the drama can never be), would a half purified drama minish aught from that satiety, or abate that feverish thirst, or assuage that corroding care? But to return. There is a being cumbered, like Martha, with over much service. Nay, even the very urgency of the duties resting on the Church in these last days may increase the danger. It is possible to forget the Master in his work, so that the prospect of his return becomes dim and indistinct, and, must I add, unwelcome. Some make usefulness their idol, and this idol-worship fosters the thought, "My Lord delayeth his coming."

So from one cause or another, and I have only mentioned a few out of many, the Church has grievously relaxed her vigil. Her children have been passing over the enchanted ground, "that country whose air naturally tends to make one drowsy." I speak not of all. The midnight cry has been raised, "Behold the bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet Him"; and there are those who have arisen and trimmed their lamps. There are those who watch for the faintest sound of the footfall of their late returning Lord. But they are few and far between—what are they among the ten thousands of Israel? And perhaps of all hindrances to spiritual life none is more insidious and none more disastrously successful than the answer to the ringing Advent cry, "Yet a little sleep, a little slumber; a little folding of the hands to sleep."

But if slothfulness with regard to our Lord's return hinders, watchfulness helps the spiritual life more than words can say. This pales the glare and glitter of the world. This lifts the heart to that which is imperishable and eternal. This lights up the page of Scripture with ever new and manifold splendours. This strengthens us, as we wrestle in prayer, until we reply, "I will not let thee go, except thou bless me." This deepens our communion with Him we shall so shortly see in that holy supper of his love, which tells of his return. This broadens our charity to all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, for one sight of Jesus as He is will strike all bigotry for ever dead. This cheers us on as nothing else can cheer in our patient

daily work for Him at home, for we hear His voice, "Occupy till I come." And this is the mainspring for missionary work among the heathen. For the time is short, and the Master near. The kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it. Shall we cast into the Lord's treasury that which costs us little or nothing? Yea, shall we keep back our sons and daughters from planting the cross where Christ has not been named, and thus hastening his return?

But above and beyond all is this vigilance blessed as fostering our deepest spiritual life, our life with God in Christ? Surely nothing can purify the heart more than the spirit which breathes in the words—

"Come, Lord, when grace hath made us meet,
Thy blessed face to see,
For if Thy work on earth be sweet,
What must Thy glory be?"

To see Him as He is, to have his approving smile resting on us, to love Him as He loves us, to be perfectly like Him, to clasp his feet, to sit down at the marriage supper of the Lamb, to share his throne, to be for ever with the Lord;—what faithful heart does not answer to this, which is *the* hope of the Church militant here on earth,—“Amen: even so, come, Lord Jesus?”

ADDRESSES.

The Most Rev. the PRESIDENT.

BEFORE we proceed with the speakers, I wish to explain that for the first time during this Congress I have been disappointed. The Dean of Lichfield, who had undertaken to speak, is unable to attend on account of domestic affliction, and I have to tender my thanks to those gentlemen who have consented to speak on this momentous subject without preparation. I now call upon Canon Hoare to address you.

Rev. Canon HOARE.

OUR subject is "Spiritual Life, its Helps and Hindrances." What do we mean by spiritual life? We do not mean activity, because (although it may seem a strange thing to say) a dead thing may work. For instance, what living man does so much work as the steam engine? Neither is it form or order, as we are taught by the vision of Ezekiel, in the valley of the dry bones, where bone came to bone—they were covered with sinews, and flesh, and skin, and they had all the beauty and form of man, but there was no life—"they had no breath in them." Spiritual life is the work of the Holy Spirit of God in the soul. Intellectually, we cannot define it any more than we can define our natural life, but we can enjoy it and be sure of it. We all know that we are alive, though we cannot tell what life is. So it is with the soul-life—we may be assured that we have it, and are thankful for it, though it is impossible to give a correct definition of it. There are three truths respecting it which lie at the foundation of the subject. In the first place, spiritual

life is a *new* life—it is not merely an amendment of the old natural life, but something entirely new. It is a birth, not a recovery; an adoption, not a restoration; a passing from death to life, not merely an amendment of a habit. In the next place, this great change is a change effected by the power of God Himself, through the Holy Spirit. We cannot give life to the dead branch of a tree. Moses and Aaron had no power to give life to Aaron's rod—they could not make it live—but God made it live, and it then brought forth blossoms and fruit. In the third place, this life is wholly dependent on union with the Lord Jesus. Nothing short of that will suffice; and just in proportion to the closeness of our union with Him, shall we possess and enjoy spiritual life. The branch has no life in it unless it is in union with the stem. The record is that "God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." And now for the helps and hindrances. It might be good logic to say, that because it is a divine gift it is independent of human helps and hindrances, but it would be bad teaching; for the Scriptures teach us that there may be such helps and hindrances, and that there are many. I will refer to one only of those hindrances—one which I believe is very prevalent in the Church of Christ: I mean ignorance of the great principle of God's application of this life to the individual soul. The gospel is not unlike a chain hanging from heaven to earth, and consisting of many links, such as the divinity of our blessed Lord, his humanity, his vicarious sufferings, his resurrection, his ascension, and his gifts of the Holy Ghost. There is comparatively little difficulty in many minds with reference to the upper links of that chain; but when we come to the last link, whereby it is hooked on to the individual soul, then a multitude of hindrances arise. There are thousands who accept all the previous links, but who are in confusion and doubt about the last—that which is of essential importance to themselves. In this state of confusion, what is wanting? (1) We want clear, dogmatic, scriptural, doctrinal teaching in our pulpits. The tendency of the present age is towards emotional religion. People constantly ask, "How do you feel?" I, on the contrary, am disposed to ask, "What do you know?" The Reformation was not carried by emotional, but by argumentative, doctrinal preaching—by clear, well-proved statements of the great truths of the gospel. (2) We want careful instruction as a help for the spiritual life; and to that end I would plead for conversational Bible-classes—not merely for the young, but for the old—not merely that those who attend may be well taught themselves, but that they may become a powerful agency for the maintenance of the truths of the gospel. (3) Then I would plead for a third point, which will, perhaps, alarm some of you, but I have no hesitation about it—I mean private intercourse between the anxious enquirer and his friend or minister. I follow the guidance of the Church in this matter. We are taught in the Communion Service, first to seek to quiet our own consciences, and in case of failure—that is, when we have failed in quieting our own consciences—to seek out "some discreet and learned minister of God's word"—he may be our own parish clergyman or not, but he must be a learned man and a discreet man, and one well acquainted with God's word—and we are taught to go to him and "open our grief," and ask his "comfort or counsel," in order that "by the ministry of God's word" we may obtain absolution, and so go our way in peace. You will observe, in the first place, that this course is enjoined only for one who has failed to quiet his own conscience; observe, in the second place, that he is to go to some discreet and learned minister of God's word; and observe, lastly, that the power by which relief is given is "by the ministry of God's holy word," and not by priestly power. The practical end of all is that he may get such ghostly counsel and advice as will lead to "the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness." I believe that in consequence of their righteous and holy dread of the confessional, a great number of our Christian laity do not use the legitimate help to spiritual

peace provided in the Church of England, and that the want of it is a real hindrance to the life of faith. For look for a moment at the result of such enquiry. I said just now it was a remedy against ignorance. My point is that there are thousands in confusion in their own minds, and a five minutes' conversation, with a few well-chosen texts of Scripture well applied, will oftentimes settle the question in their minds for life, and send them on their way happy and thankful believers. One of the most marked evidences of God having given his blessing to such an interview is that the enquirer never wants to go near his minister again. I will mention a case to illustrate my meaning. A person once came to me for such advice. After we had risen from our knees with thanksgiving, at the end of the interview, the person said, "Oh, sir, shall I see you in heaven?" I replied that I had no time to speak about that, but that if she wanted any further help I should be happy to see her here; and she answered, "Oh, sir, I have not the slightest wish to see you again here." She had learned the truth, and she was satisfied. That is the great object to be attained. It is that the enquiring soul may say, "I have found peace of mind; I see what I never saw before—I see the mode of approach to my blessed Saviour—I see the fulness and the power of the atoning blood—thank God, I see it, I accept it, and am free." I do not like alluding to others, but I cannot help contrasting with this the most sorrowful picture drawn in this hall yesterday. I have heard many painful statements at Church Congresses, but I do not remember one which made a greater impression on my own mind than that of yesterday. Mr. Compton, in pleading for sisterhoods, told us that the longer the sisters remained in a sisterhood they found the more frequent necessity of going to the confessional. He considered this an evidence that their consciences became increasingly sensitive to sin. That may possibly be the reason, but I do not believe it. I believe the true explanation to be that the opium loses its power. It may quiet the conscience for a time, but does not really satisfy the soul in Christ Jesus. So that after all their painstaking, all their working, all their self-denial, and all their confessions and absolutions, there is still such a heart-ache unhealed within their poor souls that they cannot quiet their own consciences, and are compelled to resort more and more frequently to the drug. What they want is that the blessed Saviour and his atoning blood should be set immediately and fully before the soul, so that they can see nothing else but Him, and hear no voice but his. If they have Him they have no need of the opium, for they may rest in his love during the conflict of life, and when He comes they will then meet Him with joy.

MR. GEORGE SKEY, Tamworth.

BORN again of the Spirit—a new creature in Christ—there is the origin and commencement of spiritual life; for there can be no spiritual life which does not flow from union with Christ, and there can be no union with Christ except through the energising, quickening power of the Holy Ghost. "The life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God,"—there is spiritual life in its progress and development. "For me to live is Christ:" there is spiritual life in the excellency of its power and beauty. See what is included in that short sentence—union and communion with Christ, nearness to Christ, dependence on Christ, abiding in Christ, living for Christ, serving Christ, waiting for Christ. These are all bound up and clasped together in that comprehensive sentence, "For me to live is Christ." And can you expect this Christ-life to be lived without hindrances? There are many hindrances—hindrances within, hindrances without, hindrances on every side of us. What was the experience of that noble Christian warrior whose word

have just quoted (St. Paul)? Hear him—not when he was first called into the service of his Master, not when he was a babe in Christ, but twenty-five years after his conversion:—"The good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do." "I find a law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." For a moment as he contemplates these corruptions, he says—"O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" But only for a moment. Turning the eye of his faith to his beloved Saviour and Master, he immediately exclaims—"I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." And so, through all the stages of our earthly pilgrimage, beset as we are, and beset as we shall be to the end, our refuge is the same. Often, very often, we shall be ready to exclaim, "Oh wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me?" But like St. Paul, we can look to the blessed Master, and leaning on the promise, "Sin shall not have dominion over you," we can rejoicingly say, "Thanks be to God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." The seventh speaker in a meeting like this may well feel a difficulty, lest he should entrench upon ground which has been occupied by the previous speakers: I will therefore touch only upon one particular hindrance. Your Grace, this great Congress is assembled in one of the principal commercial centres of England. The sounds and sights of commercial enterprise meet us on every side; and I doubt not that I speak in the presence of many engaged, and perhaps to some who are leaders in this busy, stirring, active scene. I speak in all brotherly love to them and to all, of one hindrance to the spiritual life—one which is the particular snare of commercial pursuits—and that is commercial success. Yes, that which is perhaps the needful stimulant and the lawful aim and object of all commercial enterprise, success, too often, alas! proves to be a great hindrance in the spiritual life. If I were asked to define the most trying period for a commercial man, I should say not at his first entering business, a young man with perhaps limited resources and many disadvantages, and when a year or two, or even a few months may decide the question, up or down; although that is a very trying time: nor when the balance sheet showed a loss and not a profit, or a diminution and not an increase of his little capital; though that is a trying time. Neither would I say it was when, after a period of success, some unforeseen and unexpected reverse sweeps away all the hard-won accumulations of years and something more; though that is a very trying experience. But more trying than any or all of these is that especially trying time when the long and ardently expected scale of profits is reached and perhaps exceeded—when the tide of prosperity rises higher and higher—when friends take you by the hand and congratulate you on your success and say how clever you are—when men who looked askance at you a year ago now rather court your acquaintance than otherwise—when you begin to speculate on next year's profits, and whisper to yourself, "I shall be a great man after all"—when visions of greatness and grandeur, of worldly fame and honour dance before your eyes; this is a trying season for the spiritual life of the man of business. Oh, beware of such a season as this! If I speak now to one who can refer to such a period as this in his history, will he allow me—for I am speaking of a hindrance of which I have had myself some little heart experience—to press upon him a word of intensely earnest and loving counsel,—“If riches increase, set not your heart on them;”—relax your hard grasp on these things—hold them more loosely. Hear the words of Him who alone can give wealth,—“The silver and the gold are mine.” My dear friend, unsanctified prosperity is no blessing. It forges new chains to bind men down to earth and earthly things; and then the heavenly, the spiritual, the eternal are obscured, if not altogether lost, in the dazzling sparks of these earthly fires.

DISCUSSION.

The Very Rev. B. M. COWIE, B.D., Dean of Manchester.

I ALWAYS think of this meeting of the Church Congress with a great deal of dread. The subject put before us is our spiritual life. This, I consider, must begin after our conversion, and that we should so progress in that life which has been surrendered to God that we may be working a good and effective journey towards the end set before us by St. Paul—attaining to the stature of the fulness of Christ. I shall not then think it suitable to speak here as I would to a mixed congregation; for I must assume that all wish for some help how to arrive more certainly, with fewer clogs and less impediment, to that state of mind which is described as “The mind which was also in Christ Jesus.” Let me put the question before you in this way. You are conscious of some inner life, something beyond that which the outward world can observe: it is in respect of that inner life that we should confer together this morning. A man may be regular, good, painstaking, quiet and honest—he may go forth in the morning at the same hour and return with equal punctuality each evening to the family circle—he may help in all good works according to his means, and bring up his family in the faith and fear of God, keeping them in due subjection as he ought—living a godly, quiet and Christian life. That is his outer life; but he has besides an inner spiritual life, in which everyday he ought to be longing to be more conformed to the likeness of his divine Master and Saviour—“changed into the same image as by the Spirit of the Lord.” It is with respect to this inner life that we are to occupy ourselves on this occasion—Christ in us and we in Christ. We have the means in the Church according to our Lord’s dying command to commemorate his death: that sacrament is the sacrament of the inner life. Then we must imitate Christ in his inner life—which I may describe as the surrender of the will to the will of God. In that surrender, these two subjects are to be considered—first, my own soul; and then the will of God made known unto me through Jesus Christ. This inner life concerns me in my relationship to my Saviour and the communion of my soul with God the Father. Everyone who desires to be in very deed a son of God is conscious in himself of certain hindrances and difficulties. We know what aids the Church has provided externally for these spiritual difficulties; but even in these very helps the evil one, in order to hinder their efficacy, oftentimes contrives to introduce a spirit of discord which is totally alien to that spiritual life which every man who has given his soul to God must long to live. One of the best methods of promoting union with Christ Jesus through the Holy Ghost is that of keeping always before us the image of the Lord and Him crucified. Whether this is assisted by the use of external emblems or not, need not now trouble us. What is wanted is Christ on the cross before our souls—Christ in his love, his devotion, and his submission to the will of his Father. If all this be present to the mind’s eye, great help is secured. For if you want to *follow* Christ, you must see Christ before you. I will explain my meaning by referring to the life of S. Vincent de Paul. When he was going about amongst lepers and ministering to persons afflicted with loathsome diseases, how did this holy man overmaster the natural disgust which such objects produced? He constantly kept before him the image of his Lord and his self-denying life, ever realising the thought not only that these sick persons were his brothers in Christ, but that in every poor afflicted sinner he beheld Christ Himself. In like manner let us in all things keep Christ before us—let everything be referred to Him. We shall find ourselves greatly relieved when we are distressed by noisy discussions if we shut up ourselves in ourselves and think

of our Lord on the cross. Let only the love of Christ in all things constrain us, and we shall be led on in the right path. I fear I have fallen into the habit of the pulpit. I was unable to be present when the first papers were read, and, therefore did not hear the line which was taken in them. I will only add that those who have surrendered their wills to God, and are being renewed by his Holy Spirit from day to day, will be helped as they go forth to their daily duties with this idea—"Always Christ—Christ in everything"—Christ before their eyes as a faithful, ever-watchful Guide and Friend. Let Him be always present to your mind. Let Him be the subject of your thoughts, and this help and aid to spiritual life will lift you over many of the hindrances and difficulties you may meet with.

REV. W. BOYD CARPENTER, Rector of St. James's,
Lower Holloway.

I FEEL sure that every member of this Congress will be thankful for this day's meeting, and thankful also to those who have read papers this morning. There is something which seems to me peculiarly appropriate, that this subject should occupy our attention on the last morning of the Congress. There are and always will be reasons why there should be divergencies of opinion amongst Churchmen, but there is something elevating to our thoughts and our hopes to find, that when they come to speak concerning spiritual life and the secret of its strength and power, they are content to speak of the same Master and look to the same Lord. Here is a symbol of hope that there may be a brighter and a fuller recognition of Christ as the all-sufficient One for time and eternity, and a fresher and fuller bond of union than we have hitherto realised. Our thoughts to-day are directed to "Spiritual Life—its helps and hindrances," and I propose for a moment to draw your attention to two hindrances which have been only indirectly touched upon by previous speakers, and on each of which I will say a few words. They are (1) a want of method, and (2) a spirit of impatience. A want of method in spiritual life is perhaps one cause of that distraction which a previous speaker has alluded to. There is not a man acquainted with business who does not feel the need of method, but when we deal with spiritual life we forget to make use of the same simple rules which they hold to be so important in our daily life. Nothing pains me so much—nothing makes me so deeply sad, as the incessancy of business demands on the time and attention of commercial men. I know how hard it is, with pressing cares and inevitable claims upon perhaps every hour, to secure a methodical dealing with their own heart-growth. But I think, in many cases, a great deal more might be done, if in daily devotion and attendance on the means of grace we could introduce a more methodical system. In the last century, the Methodists looked on life as too precious a thing to be frittered away in mere dawdling. They arranged their time so as to make it all yield fruit to the Master's service. And surely this business-like principle which was thought necessary to apply to daily life might be applied to spiritual life. If the man in business were to make it a strict rule that however much he is pressed for time he will devote a space to prayer and meditation before the heat and burden of the day—in those earlier hours which often prove a dew-drop time for the soul as well as for the earth—he might find refreshment and strength. If men would give a short time to look into the face of God—to look into the depths of their own souls, and to pray for God to bless them with divine grace before they go forth to meet their fellow-men, they would find their spirits preserved in freshness and saved from the tarnish of worldly thoughts and deeds.

And might not something of this method be carried into prayer itself? Too often there is a little haste and a tendency to hurry through the moments spent in private devotion; but there should be a little time for thought before we pray, so that we may enter into the presence of God with a due sense of his nearness. Again, therefore, moments of meditation in which to feel what we need—to feel Who it is to Whom we speak—what it is for which we desire a blessing—would be a great help to the spiritual life. Secondly, I would speak of another hindrance—a spirit of impatience. There seems to be in many Christians, and more especially in young Christians, a desire to walk faster than the Master wills. No one would wish to discourage that feeling of spiritual emulation—that desire to live day by day more like Christ—to reach a higher point of Christian experience: but there is a difference between a true desire to grow in grace, and the impatient spirit which would lead the Christian to go before his Lord, forgetting the condition of the great reward,—“These are they which *follow* the Lamb whithersoever He goeth.” There is a way in the spiritual life in which the Lord leads us on from one grace to another; and in our haste we are disappointed if we do not travel so fast as we thought, and find that we must tread the onward steps each in due course, as saith the apostle Peter:—“Giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness,” and so on: but we must not expect knowledge before virtue, or to grasp the full breadth of godliness until we have learnt the spirit of self-control. The Master seems to say—“If you will be content to be taught by Me patience in the school of Christ, I will give you grace for each day’s need and blessings fitted for your soul.” God knows how long or how short a time we have before us—let us trust that He will teach us the things best for us to know; but “in patience let us possess our souls,” so that in us “patience may have her perfect work!”

Rev. J. E. JOHNSON, Vicar of St. Jude’s, Moorfields, Sheffield.

I HAVE asked permission to say a few words, because I think both speakers and readers have overlooked a vital point as regards the spiritual life. If I know anything about human nature, there must be many who are troubled in their position in the spiritual life, and fail almost as starters in the great race set before us. There are helps and hindrances to spiritual life. The first and greatest help is God the Father, with the Son and Holy Spirit; and the greatest hindrance is Satan with his angels. We who have to live in this world surrounded by so much evil, want above all things a thorough consciousness of our own sin. That would be a great help, but we cannot have it except by the direct gift of God. We shall not get that help until we have used the means He has given us to find out how sinful we are, and in what direction. When a person becomes conscious of sin, and feels that there is something between him and his God which keeps holiness out of his heart, something which prevents his being cleansed by the blood of Jesus Christ, he wants help, and he looks for help in something to bring him closer to the Spirit of God. Had I heard the remarks of Canon Hoare before I had sent in my card, I most probably should not have passed it to the table. Still when he urged on us the importance of the inquirer coming to his clergyman and consulting with him, I felt that if a clergyman believes in his mission at all, and that he is sent as a priest of God to help and to teach, not only as a friend and a neighbour, but as a priest, he will give his people all the help in his power. There are times when people are beginning this spiritual life and feel they want something more than mere conversation—they want confession. I say that is one of the greatest of helps to the

Christian life. I speak it as an English churchman and gentleman, and I say that I believe it from my heart. Most of those nearest and dearest to me go when they feel the need of it to confession, and my hope is that my children may do so; so that I know something about it by experience. Confession and the blessed Sacrament are among the greatest helps to spiritual life. The hindrances are so many that in the few short moments left of my time I would rather not speak of them.

Rev. BROWNLOW MAITLAND.

It is with extreme diffidence that I rise to occupy the attention of this great audience with a few unprepared words on the solemn subject under consideration; but as your grace has called me to the front, my instinct of obedience to lawful authority (a virtue of which a little more would, perhaps, do no harm to the Church) impels me forward, just as the soldier, who would otherwise stand motionless in the ranks, rushes to the perilous charge at his captain's command. As our minds have been kept in severe tension by the preceding addresses—at least I speak for myself—I will put my thought in the shape of a parable. There is an interesting story told of the first introduction of the larch fir into the Scotch Highlands some time in the last century. The precious seedlings were committed to the gardener's care, potted out and placed in his warm, sheltered greenhouse, and tended with an assiduity and watchfulness which he did not think necessary for his own hardy offspring. In time a fair promise of success was apparent. The tender twigs began to throw out those delicate needles of soft green which are the glory of the larch in the spring, and the plants mantled themselves with a verdant loveliness. But before long a change for the worse began to show itself. The seedlings did not thrive, the sap rose but sluggishly, the shoots were puny, a suspicious yellowness infected the green, the slender frondlets began to droop and fall; till the gardener, seeing failure inevitable, tore up his cherished nurslings in disgust and flung them out on an exposed rubbish heap. Winter came on, and the wild winds of the north howled over their grave, the snows covered it, the frosts congealed it, the rains drenched it, and no one recked of the buried ones; but when the spring came round they astonished every one by starting up with a new life, throwing out vigorous shoots, and striking down hungry roots to make the soil their own. Taught by this strange revival, the gardener changed his style of culture, and the result was those magnificent forests which clothe Dunkeld and Killiecrankie with glorious verdure, and yield large returns for the use of man. I wish by this parable to indicate two extreme modes of the culture of the spiritual life—two ideals strongly contrasted with each other. Nothing can be further from my meaning than that caricature of person or party with which I was charged yesterday; and I beg to assure Bishop Ryan that my thought then was simply to place in contrast two ideal views and their respective practical results. Of one of these modes of cultivating the spiritual life, the magnificent *De Imitatione* may be taken as the most striking and familiar illustration, a book surpassed in circulation by the Holy Scriptures alone. Who can have read it without being awed and fascinated by its unearthliness and self-abnegation, its overpowering sense of eternal things, its passionate self-surrender and longing for absorption into the Divine Personality? Yet it has a less satisfactory side. One feels that it is pitched in too high a key for human nature, that its spiritual beauty is marred by too much self-consciousness, too much isolation, too much of what must be called religious selfishness. The world, with its tumultuous heart and multitudinous life, has vanished from the writer's thoughts

except as an instrument of temptation ; and he feels himself alone with God, caring for nothing but the culture of his own spirit to the highest perfection of which it is capable. Now, I cannot but think that the spiritual culture of which this is a type is unwholesome, and contrary to the divine intention. It is too much for our natures to bear safely. As long as we dwell in the body, and our brain and nerves are what they are, we need a mixture of earthly work with our devotions and meditations to temper their effect on our frame. Exclusive religious thought throws the mind off its balance and is apt to stimulate it into diseased excitement, or benumb it into a worn-out insensibility. It is a great many years since I read *Blanco White's Autobiography*, but a short sentence of his, summing up his wide experience as confessor, has stuck in my memory—"Nun is the superlative of old woman." There is one form of Nature's Nemesis. I pass now to the contrast. Over against the saint whose life is devoted to self-culture in spirituality I place the active man of work, who has learnt the sacredness of duty and is governed by the sense of God's right over him, and goes forth to live out his busy life as God's servant in the midst of the world. To do his duty is the ideal he aims at, throwing heart and soul into his daily work, whatever its nature, and trying simply to do his best and be above all things useful in his station. Little time may he have for self-culture : little conscious effort may he make to train himself in spirituality : his devotions and religious exercises will be, perhaps, but hastily and scantily enjoyed, for brief refreshment and strengthening, as the traveller snatches a hasty meal on his way. But let him do his work honestly, with simplicity, and without conscious self-regard ; if a clergyman, without the vision of canonries, deaneries, and mitres dangling before his mental eye ; if a layman, without making idols of wealth, or fame, or power, or other prizes of the world ; and we may be sure that there must be burning in the depths of his soul a flame of spiritual life, however imperceptible in the eyes of man. These are my ideal extremes. And now in imagination I follow them to the close of life, and watch them entering that eternal world which has rest for one of its characteristics, but, as I firmly believe, new work and service for another. Side by side, the ascetic ideal saint, nature almost purged out of him, no soil of the world on his form, his face already as the face of an angel ; and the man of earthly toil, with many a stain and scar from his life-long struggle, like the soldier returning from the brunt of war with stained and tattered uniform, his features roughened by the elements, his limbs bearing the marks of his foeman's steel ; before the throne of the Father they stand together, and as the eternal light streams on their forms, I cannot, for my own part, doubt which of the two will shine forth with the brighter radiance, and to which will come with the heartier emphasis the "Well done!" of the great King—"Well done, good and faithful servant ; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord!"

The Rt. Hon. Earl NELSON.

ON a subject such as this, upon which I feel more anxious to learn than to teach, I had no intention of uttering a word, but in obedience to your grace I will, as a layman, say a few words. I consider that by spiritual life is meant that which brings us nearer to the example of our blessed Lord. This must be a gradual work, lasting through the whole of our lives ; and it must be a work open to every Christian, however ignorant or however poor his lot may be. It is a thing about which there can be no sort of cast-iron rule. In our Father's house are many mansions, and it is not for us to decide who shall get the highest place there. Let us allow each to do his own work in his own way. My own belief is that the best incentive to

spiritual life is the endeavour to live like our Lord, never forgetting that He has given his people a work for them to do in this life, and that doing that work after his example and in his spirit will, unknown to ourselves, bring us nearer and nearer to that likeness which we ought always to have before us. My belief is that if each of us thought less of ourselves and more of other people, we should grow much more rapidly in the spiritual life than by any artificial means whatever. There are two great hindrances which I will mention. One is that when attempting to work for Christ we forget our dependence on Him. The worker for Christ must be continually laying all before Him and trusting to Him for help; and if he takes pride in his work, as though it were his own doing, he will be greatly hindered indeed in his daily walk before God. There is another hindrance in carrying out work for Christ. We must try to cultivate, by the help of God's Holy Spirit, a brotherly love for all—not for those only who work with us in our own way, but for those who differ from us. This is a hard thing to do. It requires earnest prayer and strict watchfulness over ourselves; but I believe, as one speaker has already said, that if we always try to keep the example of our blessed Lord before us—to be ever thinking of his self-denying love—we shall be better able day by day to carry out his work in his way. By combining with our love to God love to our fellow-men, we shall—imperceptibly, it may be, but very truly—be getting nearer and nearer to Him. If we have a firm desire to do his will, with a true self-reliance on Him, and without impatience at the hindrances and difficulties cast in our path, we shall be greatly helped in our spiritual life. Many who do not know how near they are to Him, but who are walking faithfully and humbly with God, will in the end find themselves to have been much more truly near to Him than ever they thought they were.

REV. JOHN GOTT, D.D., Vicar of Leeds.

IN saying a few words, by command of his grace, in conclusion, I would catch up the note left by the Dean of Manchester, as to an ever-present Lord. The spiritual life, as I know it, is a continual sense of the presence of God—equally present in the heathen who never heard of Him, and in the saint looking to see Him face to face—consciously present to the one and unconsciously to the other. The spiritual life consists in walking with God—his hand in our hand, his arm strengthening us; in talking with God continually—"To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts;" in the effort of feeling for Him; in the idea present in every act, "What will God think if we do this, or if we leave it undone?" The best means I can suggest of helping us to a realisation of God's presence is meditation—not simply reading the Bible, but bathing in it, feeding on it, drawing from it the teaching of the Holy Ghost; and on our knees, with the Bible open before us, realising the presence of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Master. As a help to meditation I would suggest taking a portion of the Bible, if only a few verses each evening, and then in the morning examining ourselves, and resolving to keep that portion of God's word in our minds all the day long. This cannot be done at second-hand; books are of little use; and the disappointments we sometimes find in meditation arises from drawing our ideas of God through others. But then we may realise the presence of God in the company of others. In this way the holy communion is the first help God has given us to realise his presence, not only with those who (like the Syro-Phœnician woman) would compare themselves with the dogs who eat the crumbs from the Master's table, but with those who eat the children's bread. Another means of communion with God is the daily service; and here I would take

the opportunity of thanking the clergy of Sheffield who have given us the advantages of daily service throughout this week of Congress. It has been the means of our realising God's presence with us, as well as our dependence on Him. The more difficulties we experience in our daily life, the more we shall feel the need of it. I remember a merchant telling me, as we walked from church early on a working day, that he did not know how he should be able to bear the incessant difficulties of trade if it were not for the daily service. A systematic use of the daily psalms will also be found to be a great help, for the Psalter is both the first edition and the constant essence of our daily service.

Anyway, St. Patrick's prayer may be ours—"To-day may the strength of God pilot me, may the power of God preserve me, may the wisdom of God instruct me, may the eye of God view me, may the ear of God hear me, may the host of God guard me against the snares of the devil, the temptations of vices, and the inclinations of my mind, alone or in company."

"Christ be with me, Christ before me, Christ after me, Christ under me, Christ over me, Christ at my right hand, Christ at my left. Christ be in the heart of each person to whom I speak, Christ in the mouth of each person who speaks to me, Christ in each eye that sees me, Christ in each ear that hears me."

In this way all around us will be helps and not hindrances to that realisation of the presence of God which is spiritual life on earth, and the counterpart of the divine life above. These are not the good days when men had "time to live and leisure to die;" but we may thus deepen our sense of God's presence—He with us and He in all we meet—and therefore the divine life of the city of our God.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 4th, 1878.

The Right Hon. and Most Rev. the PRESIDENT took the Chair at 2.30 P.M., and presided over the meeting until the close of the Bishop of Niagara's paper, when the Chair was taken by the Right Rev. Bishop RYAN.

THE SUPPLY, TRAINING, AND EXAMINATION OF CANDIDATES FOR HOLY ORDERS.

PAPERS.

The Right Rev. T. B. FULLER, D.D., Lord Bishop of Niagara.

As a bishop of the Church of God, I naturally feel a deep interest in the important subject on which I have consented to read a paper before this Congress, viz., on the supply, training, and examination of candidates for holy orders.

I lately met with the remark in one of your newspapers, that the English mind is a *practical mind*. If this be so, and of that I have no doubt, I feel that the Englishmen, and the Englishwomen too, whom I have the honour of addressing to-day, will kindly bear

with me, whilst I, a native colonial bishop, endeavour to treat of this important subject in a practical way.

In presenting this subject to you, I purpose placing it on a high level, so that, if instigated to follow my suggestions, you may aim high.

I may be considered by some, and probably shall be, plain and outspoken—it is a feature of colonial life to be so; as was often seen in the late much lamented Bishop Selwyn, after his return from New Zealand; but I trust that I shall not be the less regarded for being so. I believe, also, that it is one of the principal features of these Congresses, that everyone should speak freely. I shall, therefore, act on that principle.

The first point for our consideration is the supply of candidates for holy orders.

I am sorry to learn, since coming to England, that here, as in the colonies, the supply is not equal to the demand. How to render it so, is not clear.

I would, however, humbly recommend that the duty of devoting their sons to the ministry should be pressed more upon parents, especially upon mothers, than is perhaps being done in this country. They should have set before them the blessedness accompanying the work of the ministry, though ill requited (as compared with other learned professions) especially in the colonies—a blessedness “which this world can neither give nor take away.” If godly parents would do this, and thus turn the minds of their sons to this solemn *fact*, we might reasonably hope for a larger supply of suitable candidates for the ministry. I have been informed, since coming to England, that all the learned professions, with the single exception of the clerical, are full to overflowing.

It seems to me that the masters in your great public schools, for which England is so justly celebrated, and those called to mould the minds of young men passing through your noble universities, might do a great deal to remedy this state of things,—no doubt, would do so if they saw it their *duty* to do it.

Young men of good parts and studious habits, whose hearts God has touched with a live coal from his altar, though of humble origin, should be encouraged to devote themselves to the ministry: availing themselves of the abundant facilities afforded them in this country for obtaining a most excellent education, they would be fitted for discharging any office in the Church to which in the providence of God they might be called. But I would by no means have this influence confined to lads of low degree, but extended to the highest as well as to the lowest under their care.

The *higher* the social position in which a young man moves who earnestly and sincerely devotes himself to the ministry, the more influence will he exert in it.

I have spoken of young men whose hearts God has touched with a live coal from his altar. This I consider to be absolutely necessary for a successful ministry.

To speak to the heart, whether in public or in private, requires us to speak from the heart. To be a useful minister needs the heart

to be under the influence of divine grace. In full accord with this statement is the all-important question propounded by the bishop to the kneeling candidate for the diaconate—"Dost thou think that thou art inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon thee this office and ministry?"

In order further to secure an adequate supply of such candidates, I would humbly suggest a more universal observance of the rubric which enjoins upon the ministers of the Church the use of the prayers during the ember weeks for those who are to be admitted to holy orders; and if those prayers were devoutly used in every family in the country, they could not fail of producing a blessed result. I would also call the attention of the Congress to the day set apart of late years, by the highest authorities of the Church, as "a day of intercession for missions," and in this connection I would earnestly press upon the consideration of all devout Churchmen, those prayers offered up in the service of that day, that God would put it into the hearts of suitable persons to devote themselves to the highest of all callings, that of the Christian ministry. The fruits of the prayers thus offered up since the establishment of this service are most encouraging. Many bishops have publicly declared, that since those prayers were first offered up, they had witnessed a great increase in the number of those presenting themselves for holy orders, and in the earnestness of those who presented themselves.

Having recommended some means for securing a better supply of candidates for holy orders, the next point for our consideration is,—should they be specially trained for that high and holy calling; or should they have only that mental and moral training which young men intended for parliament, for the bar, for medicine or for business, receive at your great universities?

It seems to me, looking at these things in my humble way, that, if it is considered absolutely necessary for those men who are to advise about your properties, and for those who are to advise about your poor perishing bodies, to go through a long and most thorough training after graduating at your universities, and pass a most rigid and searching examination before being allowed to undertake such duties, it is still far more necessary that those who are to advise about your immortal souls should be most carefully trained for the due discharge of this still more important duty.

They need to be taught how to manage the Sunday and day schools of the parish, to pay parochial visits amongst their people, so that they may be profitable to their souls; to teach Bible-classes for those who fancy themselves too old for Sunday schools; to train every week the Sunday-school teachers for the due discharge of their important duties; to instruct those committed to their charge in all those things which they ought to know to their souls' health; to meet the difficulties of the sceptic, the infidel, the wicked, the irreligious, the doubting and the enquiring, amongst their people. To deal wisely with the hearts and consciences of immortal beings, to convince them of their sins, to correct their errors, to point them to Jesus as the only Saviour of sinners, to induce them to seek continually the gracious assistance of the Holy Spirit, and to lead them

to daily advances in holiness, is no easy task and a most awful responsibility. Have we no reason to fear that many an immortal being has been turned to the regions of despair—gone down to the grave, unfitted for death and eternity, because of the incompetence of his spiritual adviser? And how can young men fresh from the universities, where their term has been chiefly, if not almost exclusively, devoted to their arts course and their athletic sports, good in their several places, be expected to be thoroughly prepared to discharge aright so many and such momentous duties as these are, without any special preparation for them? I can speak from experience of this evil. When I was ordained, forty-five years ago, I had never been taken by a clergyman to the beds of the sick and the dying. All I knew of these duties was theory only. I had my weapons, but I had not learned to use them. Providentially after eight months' service in a small mission, I was sent as curate to the city of Montreal; and there I learned what ought to have been taught me before my ordination.

In this country, it is true, that those taking deacon's orders have a great advantage over those taking those orders in the Colonies. In the Colonies deacons are generally sent to the newer settlements, whilst those longer in the ministry obtain the more settled missions or parishes. Consequently, the deacons need to be well armed, both on the right hand and on the left: for in the newer settlements they are far more exposed to meet the ungodly, the sceptic, the infidel, and the open scoffer at religion, than if they were placed in a well-ordered mission or parish.

In England, generally, if not always, a deacon is placed under an incumbent who is a man of some experience in the ministry. But are these incumbents always resident? and, if so, are they always able and willing to afford their curates that instruction and training they absolutely require to render them able ministers of the "New Testament?" These are questions which you can answer more readily and more correctly than I can.

It seems to me, therefore, very *desirable* that in every diocese there should be a theological college, where there might be a good staff of professors; amongst whom there should be a professor of pastoral theology. This gentleman should be the incumbent of a neighbouring parish, with sufficient people under his pastoral care to enable the students of the college to visit the schools of the parish, to teach and catechise in the Sunday-school, to form Bible classes for those who consider themselves too old for Sunday-school, to visit (under the direction of the professor) the sick, the afflicted, and the aged; to pay, under the same direction, pastoral visits to the parishioners generally, and to accompany the professor when administering the last rites to the dying. In such a college, those intended for the ministry might be taught how to deal efficiently with unbelievers, sceptics, with the dissenters and the doubting. If they were required to write essays on these different subjects under the direction of able professors, they would find those essays useful, when they enter upon the actual charge of parishes.

Nor would lectures on elocution, on catechising, on preaching

(whether with or without paper), on the proper and impressive rendering of the services of our Book of Common Prayer, and on the management of church choirs, be out of place, or without great benefit, in such a course. When schools of the prophets of this kind can be found, presided over by men with warm and sympathising hearts—men ready to advise the young men under their care—men to whom the divinity student would open his heart and communicate his doubts and difficulties, which are sure to rise in the mind of one who is conscientiously trying his own spirit in view of the awful responsibility of advising enquiring souls—the best results must follow.

I have learned that considerable numbers of deacons placed themselves for this kind of instruction under the present Bishop of British Columbia, when rector of Great Yarmouth, and that others did the same under the venerable master of the Temple, whilst vicar of Doncaster, and that those young clergymen have made their mark in the Church.

It has been objected that such theological colleges as I conceive necessary would cost a great deal of money. But, I would humbly ask, are English Churchmen not able to give all the funds necessary for the establishment and efficient maintenance of such colleges in every diocese in England and Wales where there is not one already established? Only once *convince* them that they are necessary, and that they would be highly beneficial, and the funds would be forthcoming. Those who have built, restored, and endowed churches all over this noble and wealthy land, will not fail to provide the few millions necessary for establishing such schools of the prophets in every diocese of England and Wales where one is not now in existence.

The only remaining question for me to consider is that which relates to the examination for holy orders.

And here I would acknowledge my inability to treat this important question with any knowledge whatever of the questions propounded to candidates for holy orders by the chaplains of English bishops, for I have studiously avoided seeking information in regard to *their* examinations, so that in what I say in reference to the examination of candidates for holy orders I could have no reference to those examinations.

I consider that in their examinations, as in the examinations of candidates for the bar and for medicine, the questions should test whether the candidate has that knowledge which will fit him for discharging aright the duties of his high and holy profession. Nor, in my humble opinion, should this test be confined to the examination just previous to ordination. Theological colleges, such as I consider requisite to the best interests of the Church, would afford opportunities for the chaplains of the bishops to ascertain from time to time the points in regard to which the divinity students of the diocese were deficient, and to advise them accordingly.

This is done with the students of law in Canada, and to their great advantage. Amongst other advantages, *this* would be found no small one: it would enable a young man who finds himself

unfitted for the ministry on account of mental or physical deficiencies to retire from pursuing his studies without any discredit; and in the case of those desirous of continuing their studies, deficiencies would be discovered, faults corrected, the students better fitted for the due discharge, with God's blessing, of their most momentous duties as clergymen, by calling their attention in time to those points wherein they have proved themselves deficient, and by cultivating to a greater extent even those points in which they excel; whereas, the mode of giving them one examination only, sometimes sends young men into the ministry before correcting their faults and supplying their deficiencies.

Rev. JOHN GOTT, D.D., Vicar of Leeds.

IF the clergyman of to-day is more intelligent, more energetic, and abler than those of John Wesley's days, so, too, is the artizan,—educated by schools, by the newspapers, and his share in public affairs, by the machinery he makes or uses. So, too, is his employer,—educated by the very fact of manœuvring 1,000 men, by competition, by the desire and winning of constant improvement.

So this is where we stand to-day:—the clergyman of the past can no more minister a parish of the present, than a mechanic of the past can work a machine of the present, or a manufacturer of a hundred years ago, described by Mr. Smiles, could govern one of the great modern factories of Sheffield.

And this is the cause of this afternoon's subject:—"The supply, training, and examination of candidates for holy orders."

Of the supply, I shall say little. I think it would be well if we urged it more often in our sermons, in the society of young men, and our dealings with parents. One is conscious of waves of sentiment that head a tide, and the desire of the priesthood has moved at times the noblest and most gifted youth of their age. But other desires move our young men,—their aspiration rolls up on other shores, and the only surprise would be if it did not; for these waves of men's calling and livelihood rise and fall no more by chance than the rising or ebbing sea.

There are many excuses given for backwardness in entering upon the ministry, and the likeliest means of drawing men towards it; to which I would add this, as one of the strongest. A clergyman's life at present is altogether different to that of fifty years ago: any son was good enough for the priesthood: we lived in the reign of Jeroboam.

If it had not been for rich livings, and that holy yeast that has never been absent from the Church, the Church would have sunk into contempt. You remember Macaulay's 3rd chapter; you remember John Wesley's life: I remember, as a boy, a certain hunt, of which it was said that all the members, save one, were clergymen.

Different as we are, we are only in a transition, ripening each

year into the priesthood of the future. But a transitional period puzzles people; there is no longer the inducement of an easy life, a standard of requirements pitched low, a refuge for the failures of other professions. A clergyman now must be an active man, able to pass stiff examinations, criticised freely in the newspapers; he must spend a laborious, self-denying, devoted life. Sons and their parents have not grown accustomed to this new idea, yet they are pushed out of their old motives for entering it. This is no doubt one great hindrance to ordination; and its cure will be found, I believe, as our clergy grow more possessed with their high and responsible calling, and stand out among men as the best public servants, the most devoted lives, the representative men, *i.e.*, the true parsons of the Church. For human nature welcomes an attraction of this kind, and the best men will be drawn towards the life of a true clergyman, as they have always been in the best times of the Church. I suppose most of us know instances of this. Then, how are we to hasten the passing of the transition, and bring on the days when a priesthood of the highest, truest kind, will not only do the Church's work better, but attract, as nothing else can attract, the best and ablest laymen within its ranks?

By improving the clergy.

How shall we do this?

First, by improving ordination.

I will confine myself to this single remedy. Thank God, our clergy are greatly improving. But, the better our clergy are, the better will be our national character, and the more clergy will flock in ember-tide to our bishops for ordination, and ordination can be improved almost into a new thing.

1. *By taking the candidate in hand in his preliminary stage.*

(a.) I would reduce *literate*s to a minimum, not by withholding ordination from their class; rather I would greatly multiply the living offerings of the lower middle class.

But I would send these men to college. I would treat them as they were treated in the middle ages; as William of Wickham, with his 70 scholarships and 70 fellowships, with his 20 little quirksters preparing for, and his 20 senior fellows crowning, the mighty school for training poor boys into able clergy, without the miserable makeshift and misnomer of *literate*ship. If one man could do so great a work, lasting perhaps till to-day, and set the example which kings followed at Eton, and queens at Westminster, great London companies, and many a successful man, everywhere—surely we, a generation so wealthy and charitable, only want this channel opening to our alms, and money will flow again as it did in poorer ages, to help the boy of promise, with ordination instincts, to pass through college on his way to his bishop.

Two, at least, of our living bishops, two of the most famous I know, would have been *literate*s, had they been ordained at all, had it not been for money given them in the hour of their need at college.

I would, then, divert some of our charity into this channel, or enlarge our offerings in this direction.

(b.) *The year before ordination* should be spent in some definite and technical training.

Surrounded as we are by training ships for our navy, both royal and commercial; by military schools for the army in all its branches; by training colleges, even, for our elementary schoolmasters; I am amazed at the sloth and suspicion of the Church in providing places of preparation for her ministry—I earnestly plead for more recognition by our bishops for our theological colleges—and this in the face of a laity who are yearly growing more learned, more critical, and more exacting of the most cultivated ministry that the Church has ever been called to produce.

While our very artisans are scholars compared with the squires of Fielding's days, and with the nobles of Chaucer's time, surely it is time to equip our young clergy in some authorised and systematic way. God forbid we should go to the foreign scheme of a caste education; but even that would produce a far higher average than the amateur and slipshod way in which we are content to admit our young men to exercise the cure of souls.

I thankfully grant that very many of them surprise us by their ability, and gift of adapting themselves in a masterly style to a calling for which they have never been prepared.

But while you would not intrust your will to a solicitor who had only read a few good handbooks on general law; while you would not trust your body to a boat steered by a midddy who had only been tested by paper examinations; while you would not trust your very cabbages to a boy whom you had taken out of your national school after he had won the prize for botany; you are trusting, perhaps, not your own souls, but countless souls as tender, and troubled, and precious as your own, to young men whose qualification is a misty knowledge of the first three centuries and the Reformation; a poor facility in answering questions from Butler and Harold Browne; a rule of thumb knack of quoting texts which they have collected with their doctrinal labels, not out of the Holy Bible, but out of handbooks and manuals. The only advantage we gain from such a plan, if plan we may call it, is that it proves two things—the divine nature of the Church to stand such treatment, and the noble material of our clergy to bring so much good work out of so poor a training.

(c.) *The kind of training*—the way in which this year would best be spent, depends perhaps on the kind of work for which the ordinand destines himself.

1. About the study which is necessary for all, I need say little; only let it be, if possible, under the mind of a living theologian, not in a course of reading. To some students it is given to endow the dead with life again, and to make their authors as real living men, communing with them about many things besides those verbally treated in their books. But such readers are not common, and to all others the book becomes a power and spirit only when it is personified by some man apt to teach.

A man may learn Latin without a master, but preserve me from his translations!

2. Yet, granted that the man may learn divinity by the help of nothing but books and an examiner, we want our clergy to be more than divines; they are only one-sided men, only half-candidates at the best, if they don't know something of man as well as of God; of the sins of the people: of the flesh, half iron half clay, with a head of gold, which is the man they daily meet with in their curates' district. Their training, then, is faulty, unless it brings them face to face with men's hearts and lives. Our cloister is, I believe, an inefficient school, although its lectures were given by an Aquinas, and its devotions inspired by an Augustine.

And it is only among thousands that they can learn the art of organisation, and gain the skill of making a little time go a long way; you cannot organise a little village, therefore you cannot learn organisation, man's noblest effort, in a sweet country village. I believe, then, that a man is best trained in a city, alike for town and village work, and even for the tutorial chair. If it be feared that towns are bad places for study, I may mention that out of the twenty-four men ordained from a town clergy school, one-fourth have read the gospel, and a second fourth have been second in the examinations.

3. And he will find provocations to devotion best where he sees most need of it, where he most feels his own insufficiency. The choir of birds, the incense of flowers, and the cloister of rural peace, may be the luxury of prayer, and I think they are so; but the sins of the city, and the divine requirements of a great town, bend a man's knees, and agonise his heart, as no other spot on earth, so far as I know. You remember Canon Boyd's complaint yesterday, of the spiritual hindrances he finds in his retired and beautiful dale.

But each man's scene of preparation may depend on his character and gifts, and future sphere of work.

II. *By the separation of the examination and ordination.*

Because there is nothing so secular as an examination—its associations are all either ambitious, that men may shine; or emulative, that each may outstrip his fellow, and, if possible, be chosen to read the gospel; or purely intellectual, as a mental gymnastic. Many men are unable to cast off the flavour of the university schools, and eye the examiner as a personal enemy, who must be defeated in his attempt to throw one, defeated by any means. I have known a thoroughly devout and able man plucked by the examining chaplain for letting his neighbour copy from his paper,—very properly plucked I think; but does it not show how secular a business an examination must always be? There is, too, the uncertainty of result which generally clings to the mind of even sure candidates, a fear that unhinges their mind from singleness of aim, and greatly disturbs that proper peace, and the desire and expectancy of the great gift of the Holy Spirit, which is the natural forerunner of ordination. In a nervous mind this fear is almost unbearable, and many of the finest minds are nervous;—*c.g.*, a candidate for the last ordination, coming to bid me good-bye as he started for the cathedral of his future diocese, was so disturbed by the fear of failure, that I could not persuade him I considered him safe to pass, although, as it turned out,

he read the gospel. A vain repetition is the chapel service to minds in process of examination; their thoughts will wander off to past or coming questions, they hunt their hares over again, and day-dream future puzzles. Almost in vain are the bishop's solemn charges; they fall on strained and exhausted men, they fall like rain on the sea-shore.

I am at a loss to find any preparation for holy orders so thoroughly mischievous as an examination. The real effect will be measured by supposing a candidate for confirmation preparing by three days so spent, or preparing oneself for the holy communion by such an examination.

Then how can it be mended?

By ante-dating the examination some two or three months. I believe this to be essential to a good ordination. Then nothing will distract the candidate's heart from his self-dedication to God. He may, if he will, prepare himself as we read the first twelve were prepared, spending much time with their Lord; as St. Paul and Barnabas were prepared, in prayer and fasting; or as our blessed Master Himself was prepared by withdrawal with the Holy Ghost alone from all men.

The objections to this are not serious. Expense is often urged, candidates often live remote from their ordaining bishop. But anyway they have to be seen by their bishop before they can obtain leave to offer themselves as candidates, and the same visit might easily be used for examination. Besides, travelling is neither the tedious nor costly thing it was fifty years ago, and the Church may as well profit by cheap railways as trade and society. Men are accustomed to go up to Oxford and Cambridge, or to cross over to Dublin two or three times a year for examination; they will think as little of it in one case as in the other. This separation of examination would add to the labour also of the examining chaplains, but I greatly misjudge the character of those officers, if they would not heartily give themselves to the ordinands for such a service.

But though the cost of time or money were double, it would be well invested in a holier and better-furnished clergy.

III. *By the improvement of the examination.*

(a.) Let all old examination papers be buried, for they are not exempt from the law of corruption, or at least of staleness. The candidate is conscious he is being treated in a second-hand style, he understands he is not considered worth the trouble of a few hours spent in preparation for him, although he is solemnly ordered to spend months in preparing his answers to those disinterred questions.

Ill-furnished men, and men of a poorer stamp, are tempted by knowing that old papers revolve in a circle, or an ellipse, with an irregularity that is subject to some laws. We have all heard of worthless men winning the public praise of the chaplain by tricks of this kind.

And the examiners themselves must grow dull as they look over again and again answers to worn-out questions; how can they preserve that freshness and personal interest which is a chaplain's first

qualification? To expect it would be indeed to look for new wine in old bottles.

(b.) And we specially want new papers in a time like ours, when theologians are bringing out important works every year. Divinity is neither a dead language nor a dead science. She is a living science, and speaks to us with a warm and living voice. We have Mozley as well as Butler, and Westcott and Lightfoot, Liddon, &c., as well as the fathers of the seventeenth century. We want, not only old subjects cast into new shapes, but new subjects. Imagine the examiners at Oxford or Cambridge setting questions on astronomy or even history, such as those which they had answered in their undergraduate days. Imagine the medical examiners putting the same sort of cases before their young men that had been enough twenty years ago—enough twenty years ago only.

There was an admirable paper lately set at Peterborough on the life of John Wesley, his cause and results.

The work of a curate is altogether a new thing since the day of pluralities: let us have some questions bringing out his place and work in the Church.

England is becoming a people of towns: let our young clergy be required to know how city populations have been won to Christ, and built up into a city of God, in other times, and whatever combinations and devotional machinery are needful and available in our time.

IV. *The eve of ordination.*

That transcendent hour is so reached without intellectual fears, and the inner man can be wholly given to spiritual exercises. Gathered round their bishop, they look up to him, not as an inspector, but as a true father in God, to whom they can tell out their anxieties, and unburden their difficulties. The bishop's attitude is simply reversed by this means, for it is as natural to show one's shortcomings to a father, as it is to hide them from an examiner. Let the eve of ordination give the freest access to the bishop—let the candidates have the entrée to his study at almost all hours of those last two or three days—let them learn to know him, not an officer, but as a man who has toiled through his own difficulties, with a heart big enough to hold his new clergy and their weaknesses.

I remember a famous physician being asked the secret of his wonderful cures. "If I can get my patient to like me (he answered) that patient probably recovers; otherwise they mostly die." It is but a parable of the spiritual physician; and who doubts that if the young zealot knew his bishop as a friend, and loved, or only heartily liked him, he would easily be cured of most of his parochial and ecclesiastical diseases?

(a.) In these last three days of his lay life he would receive helps in devotion, gain perhaps for the first time the divine art of meditation, be directed how to spend time alone with as great profit as among his books or his teachers. To learn how to be and behave oneself alone with God, comes naturally to few of us; but with a

little judicious help, even a dull and ignorant man may become "never less alone than when alone."

Let some part of each of these last days be spent in meditation on the life or priesthood of Jesus, under the guidance of one who has experience in devotional ministry.

(b.) A daily instruction might be given on such matters as sermon writing, clerical study, aptness to teach, parochial visiting, &c.

(c.) The evenings might be spent in conversation on some given points, sometimes suggested by the ordinands, guided by the bishop, and enriched by some of the leading clergy of the diocese or the country.

(d.) Of course there would be the daily services in chapel or cathedral, and, if ever the holy communion may be daily, surely at such a time it harmonises perfectly with the work in hand. Nor would even the outside influence be unimportant; for those who are presently to be intrusted with the services of the Church will learn their last lessons in clear, heartfelt, unaffected and reverend ministry in the reading-desk, even from *his* right reverend bearing who will commit to them on the coming Sunday the sacred charge of ministering to the Lord's congregation. And they will learn to feel the daily service, not as another added task and a burden of supererogation, but as the refreshment and renewal of their soul, wearied and worn in the mighty labours of parochial days and nights.

(e.) Nor are some papers out of place even on the eve of ordination. A sermon may well be written, and afterwards discussed with one of the chaplains; a paper on pastoral work, and especially such an one as I have seen, having on it only two or three questions of this kind—"What are your chief spiritual difficulties?;" "Have you any doubts or misgivings?" The answers to these papers would meet no other eye, of course, save the bishop's own.

V. *The priest's ordination*: its preparation and examination should not be a duplicate of the deacon's, rather a second edition, enlarged and improved.

In many of our examinations the same papers are given to both priests and deacons; and young priests tell me they have many of the identical questions to answer that they had answered the year before.

(a.) Are there no new subjects fit for them? Should they not know something of the principles of divine service, the history of our modern missions, the doctrines of the chief Dissenters, and something of the forms and remedies of infidelity they are sure to meet with?

Probably in all large towns the curate presents himself for his ordination even worse furnished than he did the year before. It is the constant complaint, I believe, of every chaplain; and they are never too severe in their reproof of candidates for the priesthood who have spent their diaconate in neglect of their books.

But the man has surely some fair excuse, with three thousand or four thousand (I had eight thousand) souls to father and to husband, with Sunday, day, and evening schools, cottage lectures, holy communicants' classes, clubs, and guilds, for which he is responsible. I

hold it simply impossible for the deacon to study, unless he be encouraged and helped.

(*b.*) Might not the examinations be divided into two or three parts, one being held each four months, or ember, of his diaconate? The subjects the bishop requires would be divided into groups, one being taken at each of those short examinations, so the examinee would have his task given him piecemeal, of digestible size, and manageable.

He need not come up to the palace for this test of his study. Let him appear before his rural dean, who is furnished with sealed papers by the chaplain, and let the man answer the papers in the dean's presence, who will forthwith re-seal them and return them to the chaplain.

(*c.*) Another help might be easily given during the diaconate. For let it be remembered that curates are mostly gathered in towns; deacons especially are to be found far more often in great centres of population. If a country rector has a curate, he generally prefers a priest. This being so, let the bishop organise in his large towns a course of lectures to be given by his own nominees, on subjects of his own choice, in connection with his coming examination. There are in every great town some few learned and leading clergymen who would gladly give free lectures to young clergymen at the bishop's desire.

Only the bishop must urge or order the deacon to frequent these lectures, and the next examination would show the result.

We vicars of large parishes should find ourselves much strengthened in this way if our bishop threatened to allow us no more deacons if we neglected our plain duty to them, if we compelled them to be unripe priests, and laid on their shoulders a burden the Church never meant them to bear.

This overwork of our deacons is as foolish and costly an economy as the premature effort of any two-year old, only the race is a nobler one, and the runner is born in the image, and ordained in the ministry, of God.

Little that I urge is untried theory: most of it has been tested by careful experiment, in one diocese or another. And so far as it is good and true, I humbly recommend it to the judgment of our fathers in God.

ADDRESSES.

Rev. W. SAUMAREZ SMITH, B.D., Principal of St. Aidan's
College, Birkenhead.

A QUARTER of an hour does not allow time for many preliminary remarks, or for long logical processes, or elaborate rhetorical ornament. I must endeavour to say at once what points have struck me most, in my own personal experience, as to the subject before us.

Let me only premise that there is one thought which I wish you to feel lying behind all that I may suggest concerning our duty, and that is, that it is the Lord

Himself to whom we must look for a supply of faithful ministers; that it is by his Spirit alone that they can be really trained; and that they can only be fairly tested by his righteous judgment.

The first question as to the SUPPLY of candidates for holy orders, is, Where shall we get them from? To this question I unhesitatingly answer, that we should seek them from all ranks of the community—professional, mercantile, artisans, and labourers. For we want them for all sorts of work—for all that is involved in the work of the evangelist as well as in that of the pastor and the teacher. It is evident that this supply cannot be maintained without the exercise of *self-sacrifice*. This is obvious as regards the candidates themselves. They are often told, and rightly so, that they should not enter the ministry for filthy lucre's sake, that they should not seek fame or wealth or honour, but simply to promote the cause of Christ's truth in the world. But it seems to me that we often forget that there is need of much more self-sacrifice in the Christian community at large; among *laymen* as well as among clergymen. Should there not be amongst the Christian laity, as part of the Church, more subordination of secular interests to the great cause of diffusing religious truth, by a more liberal maintenance of religious teachers? We want far more aid, of an unselfish and liberal character, in supporting what is the most vital department of Church organization,—I mean, the supply of *living agents* to control and to work the machinery at our disposal. Much money has been freely spent in building and restoring churches. It would be well if more attention were paid to provision for those who minister in them. I say, distinctly, that the clerical profession should be better paid. It should not be a "lucrative" profession, such as should tempt men to enter it for gain, but it should not be so poorly paid that parents are obliged, in many cases, in common prudence, to advise their sons not to enter the ministry. Provision is not so much wanted for the opening of a clergyman's career,—(curates now-a-days are fairly paid so far as the first few years of the ministry are concerned),—but for the latter stages of the ministerial course. It is desirable that more attention and effort should be devoted to the augmentation of small livings, and to the organization of some system of pensions.

Again, I advocate more help for men in their preparation for the ministry. The foundation of scholarships and exhibitions in connection with our universities and theological colleges,—a more generous support given to such societies as the London and Bristol Clerical Education Aid Societies,—and special local assistance from wealthy laymen—would contribute much to our enabling men to come forward for clerical training who would otherwise be unable to do so.

[The speaker then referred to some special instances of generous aid whereby sums of money were placed at his disposal which had enabled him to help more than twenty students in defraying part of their college expenses at St. Aidan's during the last three years.] He then proceeded—

As to the TRAINING of candidates for orders, which is the second part of our subject, I would first say that we should distinguish between the ideal and the practicable. Instead of making too ambitious and elaborate schemes of training, let us take care that there be a real grounding of the men in the elementary and introductory knowledge of their profession. This is the first requisite of satisfactory training,—adequate *instruction* in fundamentals. Then, care should be taken by the teacher to open out to the students' minds the glances into the various views of theology and of ministerial labour with which Christian ministers are concerned. This is what I may call *suggestion*. There must of course be, in the preparatory training, such studies as will elicit intellectual power. This is mental *discipline*. Nor should we forget that there ought always to be wise and spiritual *counsel*. I believe it to be one of the most important parts of my duty as a

theological teacher to guide the emotional fervour of students into a right and sober direction.

With regard to the period of training, I do not think that, as a general rule, sufficient time is allowed for it. For an extension of this, especially by time being devoted to study before the actual entrance into a college, the co-operation of parents, and of the parochial clergy interested in any particular case, is very much needed, and would be very beneficial.

With regard to the place of training, it should be one of the universities, or a theological college, or both. There are advantages of a general and social character which can be better obtained at a university, while there are perhaps some distinct advantages of special preparation which are connected with the theological colleges. Let me say, however, as principal of one of the theological colleges,—treat us fairly—do not give us a bad name, yet expect us to turn out a very good article. We need support and encouragement, and, of course, with this, wholesome criticism. But why should some bishops, for instance, draw a hard and fast line of demarcation between theological college men and university men? I would say, approve the good whoever he be: reject the bad whoever he be.

I should like to add, before leaving the subject of the training of candidates, that I consider that the influence an incumbent may exercise over his curate for good, when that curate first comes to him, is incalculable. But this can only be done by treating the curate firmly and kindly; by taking pains to show him the various aspects of parochial work; and by regarding him as one to be helped on, instead of treating him as a mere somebody who has come into the parish to save the incumbent himself from some kind of work.

Turning for a few minutes to the subject of EXAMINATIONS, I must at once say that I do not agree with the last speaker as to the desirability of frequent examinations *after* ordination. I think there ought to be a good many *before* it. And these examinations should be conducted so as to test attainments, to estimate capabilities, and to encourage study. I think that there should be a more recognised and distinct connection between the episcopal examination of candidates for orders and the college or university divinity examinations through which the candidate has previously had to pass.

This might tend to relieve the ember week examination of the stress and strain in it to which reference has already been made. The establishment of the Cambridge preliminary examination of candidates for holy orders, and its recognition by some of the bishops, has been a step in the right direction. But more extended arrangements are needed with reference to those who do not avail themselves of that examination.

I will further state, as a conclusion to which my practical experience has led me, that while I do not wish to really lower the standard of examination, I do think that the range might be widened; that there are some cases, for instance, in which the linguistic knowledge of Latin and Greek need not be insisted on; and that, in all cases, where there is a really satisfactory result of the investigation into the previous life and character of a candidate, this may be allowed, to some extent, to compensate for feeble results in the official examination.

Allow me a word in conclusion about the general character of the clergy whom we want. We want men who are truly *Catholic*, not in a narrow, one-sided sense, but men attached to the idea of the "universal" Church—its historic continuity, its world-wide comprehensiveness, its fundamental doctrines of the Trinity, the incarnation and the atonement. We want men who are truly *Protestant*, not afraid or ashamed of that name. You heard the list of worthies belonging to the Church of England which Canon Ryle gave us as representative men. Not one of them would have repudiated, everyone of them would have rejoiced in, the name of Protestant.

And we want men who, being truly Catholic and faithfully Protestant, will be *largely sympathetic*, firm in conviction, but desirous to recognize and welcome what is good wherever it exists, not narrow, bigoted, or fierce.

To supply and to support such men ought to be regarded as at once the duty and the privilege of the whole Church community. Let us give more attention, more effort, more money to this important cause. Our prayer should be for the increase of the Church's influence for good; that men may be more abundantly raised up who, valuing Church order, valuing intellectual freedom, should, above all, prize and preach the truth as it is in Jesus, and so do the Church's work in all the varied range of the Church's power to influence men: here in one place, here in another, with many differing circumstances and methods of action, but always bearing the same gospel; qualified to comfort, to instruct, to elevate; to partake in the prosecution of science and the purification of art; to leaven society with noble aspirations and noble hopes, by commending in oral discourse, in written literature, in pastoral visitation, in holy life, the one secret of the nation's happiness and the world's welfare,—the *gospel of the grace of God*.

REV. R. B. GIRDLESTONE, Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford.

THE subject which is occupying our minds this afternoon, though not, perhaps, attractive to outsiders, is one of the most important which can occupy the attention of the Congress. In the face of our rapidly increasing population, how are we to supply the needful ministers? and in the face of our self-raised and self-educated population, how are we to supply men who are equal to the emergencies of the time? The questions, therefore, of supply and training are of the greatest importance. With regard to the question of examination, on which some stress has been laid, I am not prepared to offer any opinion, or to give any suggestion, except this, that I wish the bishops would co-operate and agree together a little more as to the choice of special subjects and special books; and I could wish, if it were possible, that they could all fall in with the scheme for the preliminary examination of candidates for holy orders which was devised, I believe, by Canons Lightfoot and Westcott, and which has received the sanction already of many of our bishops. With regard to the question of supply, the first consideration that strikes one is, What sort of an article do you want? The time has gone by when the ministry might be regarded as the refuge of the destitute; the day has gone by in which it could be said, "Anything will do for a clergyman;" the day has gone by in which a candidate translating the words *me genoito*, as was the case once in the memory of a living bishop, would gravely affirm that *me* meant "God," and *genoito* "forbid." The ministers of our Church ought to be, as far as possible, gentlemen. I do not mean fine gentlemen, but gentle men of courteous manner to the rich and poor alike. We want a man who is not ashamed to shake hands with a working-man, and who will take the trouble of removing his gloves before he does it,—a man who is not ashamed to walk into a public-house and lean over the bar and have a few words of spiritual conversation with the occupant of that bar,—a man not ashamed to go forth at any time in day and night, and kneel down anywhere when he is called, and not spare his trousers at the expense of his prayers. Again, we want our clergy to be men of vigour. We do not want either tame men, or dry men, or dormice in the Church. The day, I hope, has gone by for them. Every one is wide awake now, and we all want men of vigour, of physical power,—men who have a voice, men who can speak as well as read, and men who can read as

well as speak. We want, in the third place, men of learning, but I do not mean by that, men of classical learning only, though I could not go so far as the last speaker, in thinking that we might, in some cases, abolish Latin, for we must alter the preface to the Ordination Service before we admitted a single person who knew no Latin. Of course, the previous speaker did not mean that it was to be abolished altogether; but I think there ought to be always some elementary knowledge of Latin as a basis on which men can build up afterwards. I agree with him that there is ample room for another class of ministers for the working-classes, rough and ready, who shall receive a special kind of ordination, adapted for their work and purposes, and that they should be sent forth under the eye of the minister, the rector or incumbent of a parish, to do that work amongst the working people which is now being done by Nonconformists. Our working-man is very often able to speak admirably, as you would see if you went into his club and discussion class. Men of this stamp ought to be drawn into our work, under the eye and inspiration of the minister of the parish, and so they would do a great part of the work of the ministry. But that, of course, is not the point before us now. In the fourth place, over and above that moderate learning which a man should have, and which at least enables him to sympathise with the learning that others have, there should be the sympathy of heart with heart, with the wants and the difficulties, and the cares, and the mental doubts and struggles, and the grinding poverty which there is beneath the surface in our large towns. Then we come to what is greater—knowledge of Scripture, and to what is greatest of all—the knowledge of Him Who came from heaven to earth, and has taken the manhood into the Godhead. What is the good of my going to a man and saying “Go to Christ”? I must say to him, “Come to Christ.” What is the good of my telling him to believe in the articles of faith? I must tell him to believe in the living Saviour, Who died but is alive for evermore. That is the central truth which we have to preach, and the man ought to go forth inspired with the belief that that is really true. Now, where are these men to be brought from? Let us learn a lesson from the Old Testament, which may help us in this matter. The Levites were the *λεϊτουργοι* the “ministers” under the Aaronic priesthood, as we are *λεϊτουργοι* “ministers” under our High Priest in heaven; and we have to remember that they stood as the representatives of the first-born of all the tribes of Israel. They, therefore, are a witness to the truth that every family ought, in some way or other, to dedicate one to the service of God, and it might be impressed upon fathers and mothers, in many cases, that they should solemnly dedicate one of their children to the special service of the ministry,—not, of course, forcing them into the ministry; that is an impossibility: but leading them, as far as possible, to it. There is another hint to be got from the New Testament:—“Look out from among you men of good report.” Let the clergyman have his eye on the most promising of his Sunday-school teachers; and from amongst these, and from Greek Testament classes many a man has gone forth into the ministry. Let the masters of our public schools, and teachers and professors of colleges and universities, take the same hint. Many a man goes up to Oxford or Cambridge, who has not the slightest idea what he is going to do with himself in after life. How often, if a tutor were watchful and deeply persuaded of the necessity of the matter, would he be able to lead such a young fellow in the right direction, and land him in the grandest, noblest work there is in this world? Now let me say a few words on the training of the clergy. It is a very remarkable thing that the bishops, whilst they give a good many names of books, have given, I believe, with one exception, no hints for study. I have got the papers of twelve of our bishops, and I only find one—that is, the Bishop of Peterborough, who has the good fortune to have Canon Westcott as his examining chaplain—who has sent out with all his examination papers a small printed paper, giving hints on the study of the Scriptures. The

usual training which a man gets is of such a character as this—many are sons of clergymen, and have seen in their fathers' parishes the kind of work which is being done; many more become lay helpers, and I think nothing can be better for a man, before he takes orders, than such a course as this. Time, however, should be given to the study of the Greek Testament, and he should receive help in the method of preparing sermons, and be taught how to read them, or how to speak them. Some men go to theological colleges, and they are most valuable helps. It has lately been proposed to establish in Oxford and Cambridge another kind of institution, and we have established in Oxford a place called Wycliffe Hall, of which I have the care. There we get the advantage of a large town to work in; the students are not debarred from going to the professors' lectures. They have the libraries, and all the other social advantages of university life. Thus, while they keep afloat with their fellow-men, they have a special training for the work of the ministry; and I may say that the dioceses of Exeter and Truro are so convinced that some such thing is wanted, that instead of founding a theological college, they have resolved to found theological studentships for the benefit of graduates. As to what men are taught at Wycliffe Hall:—first of all I like everybody to be able to use his voice, and to learn how to speak and read. I am certain that the working-man loses a good deal when he comes into our Church, if the service is performed in a rapid sing-song. Next, I must teach him how to use his Bible—by no means a light task. It contains sixty-six different books, each of which calls for careful study, in the light of the original, and also in the light of men's every-day wants. When I stood yesterday at the Atlas Works, and saw that vast mass of iron being rolled, I said to one of the men, "How many sheets of iron have you there?" He answered, "Sixty-six"—exactly the number of those books which are rolled into one in our Bible, welded together by the inspiration, fire and life, of the Holy Spirit. You have all read, probably, in the summer number of the *Quarterly*, a review of the interesting and delightful life of Dr. Routh. There you find that when he was asked his opinion as to the best method of theological study, he said, "My friend, you had better begin with the Gospel according to St. Matthew, and then you had better go on to the Gospel according to St. Mark;" and so he led him, not into a course of laboured theological works, but into the critical study of those precious documents by which a man may attain, first hand, the knowledge of Christ's truth. I have only to add, that the other points I think of special importance are, exercise in preaching, knowledge of churches and sects, of home and foreign missions, of oriental and scientific discoveries, of educational and philanthropic work. But all these things are subservient to what St. Paul ranks as the highest of all, viz., the practical and experimental knowledge of Christ, Who is the Son of God, the Saviour of the world.

The following paper by the *Rev. Canon Norris, B.D., Bristol*, was read by

The Venerable Archdeacon EMERY, who said:—

I AM not at all responsible for what is in the paper I am going to read. It is really the speech Canon Norris was going to deliver. He is unfortunately detained at home; but having read the paper through, I can see it is a very valuable one, with many good suggestions.

Rev. Canon NORRIS, B.D.

I. *Supply*. When the waterworks company of some great city find that their supply is failing,—find that the local streams on which they have heretofore been depending, are no longer abundant enough for their need, and that their water is being intercepted and drawn off for mills or bleachworks, what do they? *They go higher up*, up among the hills where the streams rise, and there collect the rain-fall into reservoirs, and from those reservoirs bring it by careful gradients into their city.

Something of a like kind, as it seems to me, is what we have to do if we would obtain a larger supply of candidates for holy orders. The candidates that come to our doors by the old-fashioned channels are fewer in proportion to our need than they used to be; they are intercepted and drawn off into trade or commerce, bespoken for other pursuits many years before our invitation reaches them. What are we to do? *Go higher up*: tap the stream higher up; bespeak candidates at an earlier age. Let our invitation reach them not at twenty-two or twenty-three as now, but at sixteen or seventeen if possible, or earlier. Why not at the time of their confirmation? Why should not every clergyman who is preparing a class of thoughtful boys, rich or poor, for confirmation, ask them, “Are any of you thinking you would like to be a clergyman when you are grown up? If you are, talk it over with your parents and friends; and, if they approve, come to me again in a year or two, and I will put you into the way of it.” This first: let our invitation reach them while they are still boys, in the serious season of their confirmation.

In making it thus early, I see two grand advantages:—

1st. Well-to-do youths who are looking forward to a public school and university course—which, *if purely and diligently passed*, is the very best preparation for clerical work possible—would be far more likely to *pass it purely and diligently*, if they had already dedicated themselves or formed the hope of thus dedicating themselves to the ministry of Christ’s church. And—

2nd. Whereas an invitation issued to men of twenty-one or twenty-two only reaches those of the well-to-do classes, being altogether *too late* for the great middle class, who have to be self-supporting at sixteen or seventeen; we should by this *earlier invitation* reach this middle class, and meet with a response (as I believe) that would perfectly astonish some of us.

I have good grounds for confidence when I say that for *one* of the middle class who accepts the call at twenty-one or twenty-two, there would be *four* or *five* who would thankfully accept it, if it came to them at sixteen or seventeen, accompanied with the offer of a free or (at any rate) an inexpensive training that should occupy the intervening years.

Here, of course, lies the difficulty which you have all anticipated: How is it to be met?

I will suppose that in any given diocese, in any given year, about the confirmation season, the question “*would you like to be a clergyman?*” has been put to some 1,000 thoughtful lads; and that of the 1,000 perhaps 50 think they would like it; and of these 50, one half persevere; and after a year or two more of schooling, such as their parents can afford them, come back at sixteen or seventeen to their several pastors, saying, “Now can you help us over the six or seven years that must pass before we can be ordained?” What answer is the pastor to give them?

This brings me at once to the second section of our subject: the question of *Training*.

II. *Training*. Of the confirmation recruits who thus come for advice, I will sup-

pose that *some* are from affluent homes, and have parents who can afford for them a school and college career. These I would at once put into communication with the principal of some theological college, who should correspond with their parents, and keep up some knowledge of them all through their remaining school and college years. From such friendly counsel, with occasional intercourse, I should expect much good. The sixth-form schoolboy or undergraduate would find all his good resolutions strengthened by a few days' visit once or twice a year to the theological college, and by occasional letters. The principal of the theological college would be his good angel all through his undergraduateship.

But now for the rest and more numerous of our confirmation recruits:—those whose parents can only consent to a clerical career on condition that these years of preparation are free of charge, or almost free of charge to them: how are we to provide for them? What is the parish clergyman to suggest to his young friend who comes to him, and says, "Please, sir, I am now sixteen, and my father says he can keep me at school no longer; and I still wish to work my way into holy orders; and you said, when I was confirmed, I was to come to you for advice?"

Where am I, a parish clergyman of the diocese, to look for help? Where am I to send the youth?

Where but to my *mother church*, to the cathedral church of the diocese, in whose statutes, or in most of them, the training of youths destined for the ministry of the Church is mentioned or implied as one of their chief purposes?

I am now on ground that I have trodden before at these Church Congresses, and I return to it with increased interest.

Cranmer—who had a very noble conception how a cathedral chapter ought to continue on better lines the work of the conventual house into whose inheritance it had entered—Cranmer proposed that "in every cathedral there should be a number of students to be both exercised in the daily worship of God, and trained up in study and devotion, whom the bishop might transplant out of this nursery into all parts of his diocese."

An experiment has been made at Bristol Cathedral, which has been in many ways instructive, though it was not what I am pointing to, and is now in abeyance.

We were enabled by the Endowed School Commissioners to open a college in our cloisters for students wishing to be trained for grammar-school masterships. They were to pay for their board and lodging, and hence our temporary failure. Out of hundreds who offered, only eight were found willing and able to bear the expense. However, *eight* came, varying in age from seventeen to twenty-one, and though our college prospectus said nothing (to my regret) about ordination, yet all these eight were of the sort who would gladly have worked their way, through masterships, into clerical work. For two years I gave them lectures in the Greek Testament. I was therefore in daily intercourse with them and the principal, and know, therefore, how thoroughly they enjoyed and appreciated the cathedral and its services, and how entirely in harmony with the sacred precincts in which they lived was their conduct.

The college was closed last year for the simple reason that we failed to find middle-class youths of that age who could afford to pay £40 a year for such training. But it is abundantly evident that if we could afford to train them free of payment, we should have an ample supply of students, and (as I know from my correspondence) a yet larger and better supply, if we could make it a sure avenue to ordination.

It will be seen that this particular college had a special character given to it by the School Commissioners, which prevented it from being properly a place of preparation for holy orders; but the experiment served to convince me that any cathedral chapter wishing to constitute itself (among its other functions) a

theological college, might without fear of difficulty do so, if only funds could be provided for the support (cost-free) of the students.

How are these funds to be provided? I would throw out this suggestion: every cathedral is now spending from £400 to £800 a year in payment of its lay-clerks or singing men. And I suppose there is not a chapter that would not gladly replace them by a group of nine or a dozen students *more under the control and influence of the Church*. £800 a year would support a college of twenty students, and if each student paid a small fee of £10 (which would be desirable as a test of earnestness) there might be some twenty-five students. Some aptitude for music being required of all candidates for admission, it would go hard if the precentor and organist could not find nine or ten whom they could soon make into lay-clerks. And as the college course would be one of three or four years, there would be time for training all, the seniors being the choir.

But further into detail I need not go. Speaking from thirteen years' experience of cathedral life, I am persuaded the scheme is feasible. And though I am not as sanguine about cathedral bodies *reforming themselves* as I once was, yet they are but trustees for the Church; and if the Church were with much unanimity to require this service of her cathedrals—help in the training of her candidates for ordination—both ways and means would be found; and some members of cathedral chapters would be very grateful for more pressure in this direction.

After a few years of "plain living and high thinking" in such a cathedral college, I would by all means encourage such of the students as could find help to do so, to go to some Keble College or Selwyn College at our universities to complete their course and win a degree,—returning to the cathedral college for six months' final study before the bishop's examination.

III. *Examination.* For this last section I have left myself no time. In half our dioceses advantage is being taken of the "preliminary theological examination," so to relieve the examination-work of the ember week as to enable the bishop to make it more or less a week of retirement and devotion.

Of all our Church reforms now in progress, this sanctification of the Ember week is one of the most blessed.

The Venerable Archdeacon EMERY.

I wish to read a letter which was sent to Canon Norris by a learned divine of the University of Cambridge, a favourite pupil, and one of the best-read pupils of my predecessor—my much-loved dear friend and predecessor, Archdeacon Hardwicke—who has given himself all his life to theology and to working practically in the ministry. I will read this letter from Canon Churton, who is now one of the Senior Fellows at King's College, Cambridge:—

"October 2nd, 1878.

"MY DEAR CANON NORRIS—As I see your name as one of the speakers to-morrow afternoon, I write to urge that something should be said on the repeal of that obnoxious statute, 44 George III., chap. 43, as impeding the free action of the Church in the matter of ordination to the diaconate, and, as far as Parliamentary enactment can do so, depriving her of the power of returning to the old age of 21 for admission to the order of deacon, as prescribed in 1549. I should like the argument put forward in the hope that it would be taken up more strongly hereafter. A three years' diaconate would bring the inferior order into greater prominence, and many promising candidates for orders are ready at 21 to commence work in combination with their studies for the priesthood. It would be some

remedy for the lamentably insufficient time now usually given to special preparation for the priesthood. It would be a better way of supplying populous and scattered parishes and remote hamlets with mission services than the employment of lay-readers. Do take the matter up.—

Yours very truly,

W. R. CHURTON."

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN.

BEFORE I call on the next speaker, I can only say I wish the matter now taken up every possible success.

Rev. Canon W. WALSHAM HOW.

IN the letter just read Canon Churton has made the suggestion which I was about to begin with. I believe that Canon Norris's recommendation to bring the invitation to young men at an earlier age than at present may be very wisely supplemented by reducing the age for admission to the diaconate. It is said the men will not be so well prepared. To which the obvious answer is—Then don't pass them. By all means keep up your standard. I ask for no lowering of that. But many young men are amply fit at twenty-one, and a three years' diaconate would, I believe, be very valuable in many ways, and furnish better prepared candidates for the higher order of the priesthood. I am anxious next to commend to the Congress two instrumentalities of much value in preparing men for holy orders—one for those who have taken a university degree, and can easily afford the time and expense of further special training; and the other for those who might be debarred from seeking holy orders by considerations of time and expense. For the former I can hardly imagine anything much better than the Leeds Clergy School. I can hardly say all I would of it in the presence of its founder (Dr. Gott), but it embraces all the advantages of a theological college, with the best opportunities of training in pastoral and parochial work. These opportunities are not always to be had in a cathedral city, and I think in some dioceses it might be well to place the college for the training of young men for the ministry, not in the cathedral city, but in one of those centres of dense population where, as we have already been told, the spirit is stirred, and the heart moved, and the knee bent by the things which are daily seen and heard. For those to whom economy is necessary, the late Bishop of Lichfield's plan seems admirably adapted. Young men of promise are encouraged to come to Lichfield to pass an examination every six months for two years, remaining in their business or employment. At the end of that time one year's residence in the theological college is all that is required. As examining chaplain, I can bear witness to the success of this experiment in the way in which some of these probationers have passed their final examinations. The point, however, which I am chiefly anxious to recommend is the increase of the devotional element in the more immediate preparation for the day of ordination. I remember how one young man, coming back from his ordination, in a diocese I will not name, said to me, "Oh! if I could have had only a squeeze of the hand and a 'God bless you!'" It was all so cold. It has been sadly cold business-like work too often. Thank God, things are changing fast. I would plead for the universal observance of the

last two Ember days—the Friday and Saturday before ordination—as days of devotion. For this to be, the men must know their fate on the Thursday evening at latest. A man full of fears as to passing cannot, of course, enjoy acts of devotion. This would shorten the days available in the Ember weeks for the examination. Yes; but surely the more secular part of the examination might be got over at a previous time—for example, when the men go up, as they do in some dioceses, for a preliminary examination. Or why could it not be done in the same way in which we conduct our examination of pupil-teachers in religious knowledge, as many centres as may be convenient being chosen, and some person being responsible in each for the due conduct of the examination? The truth is, there is no difficulty worthy of being called an obstacle to the plan, and when it has been tried it has been welcomed with gratitude by the candidates. Once before at a Church Congress, when I advocated this devotional observance of the last two Ember days, a very worthy bishop argued that the young men are not fitted by previous habits, are not sufficiently advanced in devotional practices, to be able to enter into and appreciate such observance. Something of the nature of a retreat, he thought, might help maturer Christians, but it would be laying too great a burden upon these young men. And yet, my lord, these young men are supposed to be fit to lead others, and to teach *them* habits of devotion. But, indeed, it is not so. In many of our candidates there is an earnest longing—nay, a very thirsting—for such help at the time of their ordination. Their hearts are full, their spirits are lifted up within them, and they are deeply grateful for such days of quiet prayer and meditation and counsel. But others are not so. I know it. There will be many unused to anything of the sort. They will be perplexed, distracted, uncomfortable. They will find themselves unable to do much in the way of prayer and meditation. Well, my lord, is this an evil? Is it an evil to find out one's own weakness? Why, we are all trained to higher things by discoveries of our inability to rise to the standards set before us. As well pare down our devotional expressions in the Prayer Book to the scanty meagre measure of our own wretched experiences. I know it is humbling. Is humility a bad thing to learn? Well, I plead for this devotional observance for all, because I am sure it is wholesome for all. Let a considerable part of the two days be allotted to devotion. Let there be short services at various hours in the bishop's chapel, with times of silent prayer. And let there be three or four addresses each day, some taking the form of meditations, some spiritual and personal, some practical and pastoral. We want our young candidates trained to be shepherds of souls, and I do not think it was of the one Good Shepherd only in relation to his flock that it was said, "He goeth before them."

Rev. Dr. THORNTON, London.

IN order to determine what kind of training is needed for a candidate for holy orders, I presume we must ask the question put by Mr. Girdlestone—"What kind of article do you want?" I answer, first, most emphatically, we want ministers of the Reformation, men who have no craving or hankering after a sentimental mediævalism. Then, we want catholic priests. I mean by "priest" exactly what the Church of England means—no more, no less; and by "catholic," I mean a man of extended sympathies, not a mere minister of an insular sect, but one who feels himself an accredited and privileged servant of the faith held throughout the whole length and breadth of the world. But, then, we do not want a seminary priest; we want one who knows something of social and domestic life, who is con-

versant with the difficulties and needs of the ordinary men and women to whom he will have to preach and minister—one who is able to officiate and teach in public and private, and give instruction and counsel, and above all, to meet the opponents of Christianity, and the opponents of the Church. And then, again, we want a man of God, not a man who has a thin veil of professional decency thrown over a worldly life and heart, but a man who can preach Jesus, because he knows Him. How are we to get him? and what kind of training must he receive? The training must assume three forms. It must be intellectual, moral and spiritual, and practical. First, as to the practical:—I regret that I must differ from the right rev. prelate who read the paper at the beginning. I do not think that much can be got by practice before ordination. I do not believe you can teach pastoral work as you teach pathology, by clinical lectures. Then, as I have said, we want special training of the mind and the understanding and the heart. Can that be had at the university? The experiment, I know, is being tried; my recollection of the university makes me not very sanguine about the results. There are habits, not immoral, nor in the least degree wrong, but not desirable in the preparation of a priest, which men contract at Oxford and Cambridge, and which they should have the opportunity of dropping. We want, I am sure, the training college. But we don't want our training college to be an ascetic monastery; we want it to be a real college, and not removed from the haunts of men, but in the town. As for the various things to be taught, it is impossible to specify them here. Music and architecture, and other minor matters must not be ignored; then there is theology in all its various forms—and above all, the Scriptures. We want to have the Scriptures studied as the good old English divines studied them, because we want the right article produced—the real English divine. Now, we have been told by a great painter, “If you want to paint as Raffaele painted, you must study what Raffaele studied.” So, as you want to produce something like an old English divine, your candidates must study what the old English masters of divinity studied. And so I cannot possibly agree, even under the most pressing wants of the Church, to give up our present standard of clerical education. I hope it will never be lowered; nor can I agree with the proposal that the original language of the New Testament is not to be indispensable. I was also going to make a protest against diminishing the age for the diaconate. I am very much afraid of consecrated boys. However, as those who know so much more about the matter than myself—Canons How, Norris, and others—think this change should be made, I withdraw my protest; only under no circumstances let the age for the priesthood be lowered. As to ways and means, I add a further suggestion to Canon Norris's solution of the difficulty. If young men with a vocation are not able to draw from their fathers' or from their own pockets sufficient for their own maintenance during the period between leaving school and receiving orders, why should they not go into business? Why should they not keep their names on a register of names of persons desiring holy orders, and then go into an office or counting-house for four, five, six, eight, ten years? The business habits they would acquire would not make them a bit the worse ministers. We are often told that the clergy are not business-men; well, then, this plan of mine, if carried out, would be so much the better for the Church. Let them go into business, and keep their eyes on holy orders as an ultimate object to be attained. There might be some person or persons appointed who should keep the register of names, visit and confer with them from time to time, correspond with them, and help them on in their studies, till at last they come to the training college to pass the absolutely indispensable year before presenting themselves for holy orders. We cannot, or rather must not, of course, restrict holy orders to the upper classes; we want to draw our candidates from all ranks. However, there is one thing to be remembered, that when we penetrate to a lower social stratum, we shall have to teach certain social refinements. They are

very little, in themselves, but still important to the priest, When I was in Scotland, I had to deal with men not drawn from the highest classes. The Scottish episcopalian gentry, when they destine their sons for the priesthood, send them to be educated in England, so of course I had to deal with men, able and excellent indeed, but of a somewhat lower class. I applied to them what I call "social sand-paper." When I had a dinner party, one or two of the students were usually among the guests. They thus learnt much that they would not otherwise have known of social matters; and a very practical man, dining with us on one of these occasions, turned to my wife and said, "This is as good in its way as any one of your husband's lectures." During my experience there, and subsequently as commissary to a colonial bishop, I have been brought into contact with numbers of men with whom I am at a loss what to do,—men who are not fit for the priesthood, and never can be; but who yet have a great desire to work for the salvation of souls. I have one in my eye at present. I cannot think he will ever be able to become a candidate for ordination; but he is earnestly desirous to be a preacher of the word. He has a considerable power of oratory in his way, and a capacity of influencing men, but is not quite what we want as a priest. What are we to do with such men? We want to retain them, and to employ them. The fact is, we must work for an order of Dominicans in our Church,—such an order as John Wesley wanted,—to preach from experience, not the glories of Mary, but the love of Jesus.

Rev. Canon RYLE.

WITH regard to the supply of candidates for holy orders, it is, beyond all doubt, not equal to the demand. One cause, I think, of the supply being inadequate, and which needs mention, has not been touched upon. Competitive examinations carry off many young men. Others are induced by high salaries to enter secular callings. But, there is one reason, I am sorry to say, which actuates a great many young men at Oxford and Cambridge, and which did not exist in days gone by. I refer to the amazing amount of unhappy divisions and controversies within the Church of England at the present time. I state what I know, and I can testify to what I have seen. There are many young men who are indisposed to take orders, because of the sad conflict of opinion which they see existing among Churchmen. Be the causes what they may, we want to see the supply of candidates increased. It ought to be an earnest prayer with us continually, day and night, that there may be a greater supply of young men prepared to take orders. I cast in my lot entirely with those who do not wish to lower the standard of ministerial qualifications. I think my friends on my left were somewhat misunderstood when it was supposed they said they did not think candidates need to know much Latin and Greek. I believe myself that a man might do a great deal of good work without these languages. Still, as a general rule, I am in favour, in these days of education, of keeping up a high standard of ministerial attainment. Never let it go forth that the clergy are ignorant men. One remedy for the lack of candidates appears to me to deserve attention. I should like to see a revival of the separate order of sub-deacons. I believe that many young men would be willing at nineteen or twenty to join the staff of the Church, working quietly for some two or three years, under some suitable minister. You would thus get hold of a number of men, sons of shopkeepers and people in trade, who cannot wait now till the age of twenty-two or twenty-three, because at eighteen or nineteen their parents call upon them to take up some calling which will enable them to support them-

selves. The result is that they go into secular business, and are lost to the ministry of the Church of England. With regard to training for orders, I must still think, after all that has been done of late years, there is something defective about it. I find that young men often take holy orders without any systematic knowledge of divinity. They have no idea of what is first, and second, and third, and fourth, in the roll of truths, and if you ask them to put down an orderly system of scriptural Christianity, they cannot do it. There is besides this a grievous want of knowledge as to what is preaching, how to compose a sermon, and how to read a sermon when composed,—and how to make it strike and stick. These are points on which our young curates want a great deal more training than at present they seem to get. I own that I am entirely against the multiplication of theological colleges. I thank God for those we have;—for St. John's, Highbury; for St. Aidan's, and others which I have not time to name. But this I say: we have got enough of them, and I do not think we want any more. I do not want, as a rule, to see young clergymen brought up in separate institutions, as a special class by themselves. I want to see them brought up at Oxford and Cambridge, and mixed up with other men there. Education is now so much cheaper than it used to be at both our great universities, that there is not the same need for theological colleges that there used to be in days gone by. I thank God, myself, for the establishment of Wycliffe Hall, at Oxford. I believe it is a move in the right direction. It moves slowly, I dare say: it has not many students at present: but I should be sorry to see an infant begin to talk as soon as it was born; and we must give it time to grow. After all, the trees that last the longest grow the slowest, and I hope my friend Mr. Girdlestone will not be discouraged from going on with what he has begun. The day may come when Wycliffe Hall will be a very prosperous and useful institution. I must be allowed to say one word on the importance of training up our young men for the ministry with a thorough knowledge of Holy Scripture. I have spoken with more than one bishop on the subject, and have been told again and again that if there is any one point on which the young men are deficient, it is the knowledge of the Word of God, without which of course they never can be useful as clergymen. After all, you will bear in mind that there is no good work which can be taken in hand so usefully, and which is so important as that taken up by those who train young men for the works of the ministry. Dr. Chalmers was a most successful preacher at Glasgow, but after some years he left and went to St. Andrew's, as the principal of a college there. Well, he afterwards met a plain Glasgow Scotchman who knew him intimately and often came to his church to hear him preach. The man said, "Why, doctor, to think you should be leaving your great congregations, to go and be a dominie!" "Well," said Dr. Chalmers, "you know something about the salting and curing of pigs. Which do you think is the most useful man,—the man who manufactures the salt, or the man who salts the pig?" "I have no doubt," said he, "the man who makes the salt." "Yes," said Dr. Chalmers, "and that is exactly what I am doing, by teaching and training young ministers; I am sending forth men from St. Andrew's, who will salt a great many parishes all over Scotland."

Rev. Canon BULSTRODE, Ely.

SOME remarks of Dr. Gott seem to me a reflection on a class of theological colleges which have done and are doing good work. I am quite aware of the value of a training such as he speaks of in the active scenes of a busy city; but I am inclined

to think the diaconate the season for such training, and that the year preceding ordination may be more profitably passed in the quiet of a cathedral town, where frequent services and opportunities of devotional exercises are afforded, than in the incessant activities of a large and busy parish. I was quite alarmed when I heard Dr. Gott's description of the many things a theological student was to learn in a year. We heard of devotional habits to be formed; of capacity for managing day and Sunday-schools to be attained; of instructions to be had in district visiting, besides other things which have to do with ministerial usefulness; and all these to be got hold of in that year before ordination, which, to my mind, would be better employed in well-guided theological reading, and in the formation of those devotional habits which lie at the root of all true clerical success. In looking back to the period of my own life passed at Cuddesdon, my more satisfactory recollections are of its well-guided course of theological reading, and its devotional system, rather than of any guidance I had in district visiting, Sunday-school teaching, or anything of that kind; and I confess a decided preference for a year's distinct training in such a college to spending the same time in the midst of the activities of parish life. Something done well which fixes life's purpose is better than many things done indifferently in which no quiet purpose can be reached.

With regard to the supply of candidates for orders: if it is true that there is a dearth of candidates, it may be necessary to find new sources of supply; it seems very undesirable to depart from the present system of expecting a university degree, followed by special theological training. We must look to the universities for our main supply. But there are many men who have been engaged in business, and during that time have given no mean help in Church work, and in that very work have had no unimportant training for holy orders, who perhaps at 28 or 30 years of age determine to give themselves to the ministry. We meet such men at once with a demand for Latin and Greek, in neither of which they have had any previous training: if they persevere they must give up an immense deal of their college time to the irksome work of the rudiments of those languages. I do not hesitate to say that the time would be better spent in a well-arranged course of English theological reading. Our persistency in insisting upon this classical knowledge blocks many a good man from the ministry, or compels him to waste, on that in which he cannot attain much proficiency, time that might be much more usefully and profitably employed. We have not at the present time in the National Church openings for the class of men who now make useful and efficient Congregational ministers. I am no advocate of ignorant priests; but I think there should be in the Church openings for such a class of men; and without the classics we might train men whose voices would ring in our pulpits, and whose holy eloquence might bring many souls to the foot of the Cross, and link the Church through our ministry with a class of society on which at present it has but little hold.

With regard to selecting boys from our parishes, and helping them in their training, there is very much to be said; but, in the first place, boys' minds are hardly formed to choose definitely the clerical profession—and I do not think we need go begging for candidates. The clerical profession is a noble profession, and those who wish to enter it ought to be prepared to make some sacrifices themselves; and help should only be given in very clear and few cases; but if boys are chosen, it would seem better to throw them into the life of a public school, where their characters may be tested, rather than keep them fixed to the ministry by a long special training.

I am not inclined to go in extensively for educating the clergy at public expense; and I venture to think that while a cathedral, with its devotional system and its high-class services, is the best place for a theological student during a year of preparation for orders, it is not so good a place for boys, or that it would be well to

establish at these centres schools for boys intended to be clergymen. Let them knock about with other boys in public schools, and get the training which will make men of them before you ask whether they will be priests.

Rev. Canon CLARKE, Vicar of Christ Church, Southport.

DURING the few moments that I shall occupy your attention, I wish to speak of the great importance of young men who are preparing for the ministry, at the universities giving attention to the art of reading, and to the cultivation of fluency in extemporary addresses. There are certainly at Cambridge, and I believe also at Oxford, daily prayer meetings held by the undergraduates. By attending such meetings and occasionally taking part in them, young men may acquire facility in the utterance of extemporary prayer which will prove of immense use to them afterwards, when as clergymen they are called upon to visit the bereaved, the sick, and the dying. I think that when young men intended for the ministry are sent to Oxford or Cambridge, they should be made aware of the existence of these meetings, and that they should be urged to attend them. I believe it to be of immense importance likewise that young men should learn to read the Liturgy and the Lessons with solemnity, good taste, and correct emphasis. Professor D'Orsey, of Cambridge, has stated that, in the reading of the first exhortation in the morning and evening services alone, some dozen mistakes are almost invariably made. When I was myself at the University of Dublin, I took part in the founding of a society which, for want of a better name, we called "The Scripture Lecture Society." The members met weekly for devotion. We admitted no strangers. One of us read half the evening prayers of the Church of England; another read the concluding prayers; another the first, and yet another the second lesson. Another gave a sermon, usually written; another an extempore address, limited to twenty minutes. Then the chairman gave another a text, which he took into another room and prepared for ten minutes; and then returned and preached on it for ten minutes. Thus six members were employed at each meeting: and very pleasant and profitable meetings they were. When I was being examined for ordination, Bishop Sumner, of Chester, gave each of the candidates a text, and we were required to write a short sermon upon it, and afterwards read it to the bishop himself. Such was his invariable custom. When my turn came, I read my sermon on the text,—"Come unto me, all ye that labour, &c." The bishop heard me out, and then said,—“You must have had experience in the preparation of sermons.” I told him of the society I have just described, and he highly approved of it. I found afterwards that the good bishop used to speak of this society to the young men who came up from time to time for examination, saying that he greatly wished that similar societies existed in Cambridge and Oxford. I have not time for any further remarks.

CUTLERS' HALL. FRIDAY AFTERNOON,

OCTOBER 4th, 1878.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF CARLISLE took the Chair
at 2.30 P.M.

WHAT DEFINITE RESULTS AS TO THE INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE HAVE BEEN PRODUCED BY THE DISCOVERIES IN EGYPT, NINEVEH, PALESTINE, AND THE CATACOMBS OF ROME?

PAPERS.

Rev. Professor RAWLINSON.

THE inexorable "twenty minutes" law under which we speak at Church Congresses (though slightly relaxed by our chairman on the present occasion) will prevent me from making more than one preliminary remark. This is, that not being very familiar with the subjects of Palestine and of the Roman Catacombs, I do not intend to touch upon them, but shall confine myself to the two other points suggested by the question just read to you—the discoveries in Egypt and Nineveh (or rather Egypt and Mesopotamia), and the bearing which they have, separately or collectively, on the interpretation of Scripture. I trust that some one better acquainted with Palestine and with the Catacombs than I am will, before the discussion is over, supply the omission which I am unfortunately obliged to make from lack of special knowledge.

To give the meeting an idea of the general effect which has been produced by the Oriental discoveries in connection with interpretation, I must begin by taking them back a period of some thirty years. Thirty years ago the system of interpretation almost universally prevalent in Germany, and largely current among ourselves, was that which has been called the "mythological." The Old Testament almost wholly, and the New to a very great extent, were resolved into a bundle of myths. It was taught generally that the sacred narratives were not, and had never been intended by their writers to be regarded, as relations of actual occurrences or facts, but were romantic tales, the inventions of their various authors, who, either proceeding on a basis of fact, dressed up their narratives out of their own imaginations with any details that they thought graphic or striking, or in some cases proceeding from an imaginative basis only, wrought out the entire tale from their "inner con-

sciousness," being intent on nothing but on impressing upon their hearers certain important moral truths. As the book of Job has been in all ages of the Church considered by many to be not really a history of events that occurred, but a moral and religious apologue, the invention of the writer, intended to illustrate and enforce certain duties and to teach certain great truths; so, it was confidently asserted by the great bulk of Continental writers thirty years ago, were all the (so-called) historical books, at any rate, of the Old Testament, which were merely written in a narrative form owing to the inveterate Oriental love of story-telling as a vehicle for the advice and instruction which it is sought to convey, and were never intended to be mistaken for accounts of facts. A division of the tales into "myths" and "legends" was attempted, and it was sought to point out which of them were most properly to be regarded as coloured and poetical representations of some actual occurrence, or set of occurrences, and which might with confidence be referred to the single source of imagination or invention.

In support of this general theory it was urged—First, that the real course of mundane history, as known to us from other authentic sources, was perverted and depraved by the sacred writers, whose representations were constantly at variance with those of the best-informed profane historians, and could not be twisted into agreement with them without manifest partiality and unfairness. Among crucial instances were put forward the pre-eminence of Babylon over Assyria in the early times, the late appearance of Assyria as a conquering power, the Cushite character of the early Babylonian monarchy, the implied subjection of the Medes to Assyria at the very time when they attained independence, the pure invention of a Babylonian king named Belshazzar, of an Ethiopian monarch called Zerah, and of an Assyrian monarch called Sargon, of whom profane history ignored or disproved the existence. Secondly, it was said, the unhistorical character of the narratives is evidenced by the complete misrepresentation of the manners and customs of the divers countries where the scene is laid, which the writer of an imaginary tale naturally might be ignorant of, and would not even care to represent accurately; but which a historian, more especially a contemporary historian, such as the writers of the sacred books are traditionally supposed (for the most part) to have been, would be bound to represent with accuracy. Crucial instances under this head were supposed to be Egypt as set before the reader of the Pentateuch, Babylon as described by the Prophet Daniel, and Persia as depicted in the book of Esther. In these cases the writers were taxed with extreme and extraordinary ignorance of the true habits of the countries, or with the strangest intentional misrepresentation of them.

To shew what was the general result produced by these assertions and the reasonings based upon them, I will quote one or two passages written about thirty or forty years ago, by writers of the most opposite schools, indicative of the hold which the mythical interpretation had taken upon Germany at that time, and which it was beginning to take among ourselves. "Tradition," said De Wette, "is un-

critical and partial ; its tendency is not historical, but rather patriotic and poetical. And since the patriotic sentiment is gratified by all that flatters national pride, the more splendid, the more honourable, the more wonderful the narrative, the more acceptable it is : and where tradition has left blanks, imagination at once steps in and fills them up. Such is the character confessedly of a great part of the Old Testament. "The series of events related in the Old Testament," says Strauss, in 1840, "constitutes a whole belonging to the province of poetry and myth." They are "not true history, but a sacred legend." "Rationalism," remarked Keil in 1847, "has so firmly planted its foot on the Old Testament that many an acute theologian has doubted whether it is possible ever again to rescue from it the historical writings of the ancient covenant, or to restore among men a belief in their divine authority. . . . The believing theology can now find in the whole narrative no objective ground or stand-point free from uncertainty."

It was when things were brought into this state, when the mythical interpretation had thus triumphantly established its complete dominion over the Scriptures of the old covenant, and, flushed with their success, the victors were entering upon a war the object of which was equally to demolish the historical value and authenticity of the new, that by God's providence the wonderful series of discoveries which our own times have witnessed were brought about. When man was silenced, the "stones" were made to "cry out aloud." The mounds of Babylonia and Assyria were ransacked and gave up their treasures : the previously inscrutable enigmas of the hieroglyphic, hieratic, and cuneiform characters were penetrated ; the languages of Ancient Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, Persia, were recovered—a contemporary literature was dug out of the earth—paintings and sculptures revealed the manners and customs of the people—a light was shed upon ancient history such as it had never received before—and an opportunity arose of testing the historical value of the sacred narrative such as the world had never previously possessed, nor even imagined that it ever could possess. Then, once more, with the fresh light thus acquired, the comparison was made between the sacred narrative and the real history of the various ancient nations as made known by their own contemporary writings and works of art, and the result was the discovery of a most remarkable accord : the crucial instances of disagreement turned out to be in almost every case the exact contrary, to be in fact striking instances of agreement ; and the main ground of their reasonings being thus struck from under the feet of the mythical interpreters, their whole system collapsed : and I think it is not too much to say, that now they have not a defender, scarcely an apologist. The system of literal historical interpretation which has prevailed in the Catholic Church from the first, which even Origen never really set aside, is vindicated and established on an unshakable foundation by the exact and minute agreement which is now found to exist between the sacred narrative and authentic profane history.

I have hitherto spoken in a general way : I must now come down to details. I imagine you would wish me to show you, so far as time

allows, how the recent discoveries have met and discomfited the "Mythologists," establishing the literal truth of the sacred narrative and its accordance with history, where the very reverse was alleged and contradiction supposed to be proved. I will take, then, the series of "crucial instances" to which I have already referred, and shew the light which the discoveries have thrown on each of them.

1. The pre-eminence of Babylonia over Assyria in the early times is distinctly asserted in the tenth chapter of Genesis. It was distinctly denied by the celebrated historian Ctesias, who declared that he took his history of the East from the Persian archives, and was generally followed by the later Greek and by the Latin writers. Here, said the mythologists, was a plain contradiction. Of course Ctesias was right; of course the Bible was wrong. The fact was, that the writer of Genesis, living probably in Babylon during the captivity, inserted an old worthless Babylonian legend into his narrative to please his masters. Well, it was possible to make *some* answer to this—to dispute the conclusion arrived at—before the late discoveries; but the matter must always have remained in doubt, disputable, had it not been for the cuneiform records. Inscriptions disinterred both in Assyria and Babylonia, quite independent, but wonderfully in accord, have shewn that it is Ctesias, and not the author of Genesis, who is wrong—that Babylon was the first seat of empire in Mesopotamia; that Assyria was for a long time subordinate, nay, subject; and that it was only after a space of nearly a thousand years that this subjection was thrown off and that the Assyrians became an independent nation. The early Babylonian monarchy, which Scripture calls "the kingdom of Nimrod," is an "established fact," and now assumes its rightful place in all modern "histories" or "manuals of history."*

2. The Cushite character of the early Babylonian monarchy is indicated in Genesis by the statement in the Toldoth-Beni-Noach, that "Nimrod was the son of Cush." Here again, it was said, was a clear mistake—nay, almost an absurdity. The Babylonians were well known to be of the Semitic family, akin to the Arabs, Syrians, and Jews; not Cushites or Ethiopians. In fact there were no Cushites in Asia; an Asiatic Cush was a pure figment of Biblical interpreters; it "existed only in their imaginations," and "was the child of their despair." Such were the expressions used as late as 1854. But a few years later the study of the primitive Babylonian language, then first exhumed, convinced the best cuneiform scholars that the earliest race which had left remains in the country was pre-eminently Cushite, and that Semitism came in and prevailed subsequently. It is now almost universally allowed that a Cushite or Ethiopian civilisation, akin to the Egyptian, was the first developed in Babylonia, and that the empire of Nimrod and his people had a Cushite character.

3. The late appearance of Assyria as a conquering power contra-

* Smith's *Ancient History*, vol. i., pp. 188-211; Lenormant's *Manuel d'Histoire*, vol. ii., pp. 16-42; Rawlinson's *Manual of Ancient History*, pp. 25-27.

dicted Ctesias, who placed the beginning of the Assyrian empire more than two thousand years before our era. Scripture gives no clear indication of the Assyrians having attained to greatness earlier than B.C. 770, or, at any rate, than B.C. 1036, when they seem to have fought against David.* It was argued that here again there was a conflict between the sacred and the profane, and that the profane being necessarily right, Scripture must be wrong. But the comparatively *late* rise of Assyria is now an accepted fact. The statements of Ctesias are rejected as "legendary" and "fabulous," and it is distinctly laid down in the best manuals of ancient history, that "at the present time positive monuments render it impossible any longer to doubt that the Assyrian monarchy did not make its appearance until the 15th century before Christ."† (I quote the words of Lenormant, who is certainly no bigoted adherent of orthodoxy.)

4. The subjection of the Medes to Assyria in the latter part of the eighth century before our era, is indicated in Scripture by the statement that, when the Assyrians on their conquest of Samaria (ab. B.C. 720) deported the great mass of the inhabitants, they placed a portion of them "in the cities of the Medes." (2 Kings xvii. 6; xviii. 11.) This could not have been done unless Media was subject to them. But Ctesias assigned to the independence of Media the date of B.C. 876, and even Herodotus seems to have supposed that it began as early as about B.C. 750. Assuming that these writers (one or the other) were to be depended on, the critics noted that here once more the true course of history was at variance with the scriptural narration, the writers of which (they said) were ignorant of the true date of Median independence. The Assyrian monuments have furnished a complete answer to this objection. They shew unmistakably that the subjection of Media to Assyria continued at least as late as B.C. 670, and make it probable that the real independence did not commence much earlier than B.C. 633. Sennacherib and his son, Esarhaddon, both of them, exercised dominion over Media, and another king of the period actually relates that he placed colonists in the Median cities.

5. Isaiah, the writer of a portion of the second book of Kings (2 Chron. xxxii. 32), mentioned a Sargon in his prophecy as a King of Assyria, who warred in Southern Syria, where he "fought against Ashdod and took it." Profane history, it was said, knew nothing of this Sargon, who seemed to be a pure invention of the author of the prophecy, and at any rate could not have been a great conquering monarch, since he was unknown alike to Berosus, to Herodotus, and to Ctesias. The discoveries of the French explorer, M. Botta, at Khorsabad, set this objection at rest, shewing as they did the great power and might of the Assyrian sovereign who had there built a magnificent palace, and emblazoned upon it his successes—among the rest his capture of Ashdod—a monarch who gave his name as

* Compare Psalm lxxxiii. 8, with 1 Chr. xix. 16.

† Lenormant's *Manuel*, vol. ii. p. 56.

Sargon, and appeared to have been the father of Sennacherib. Scripture, instead of being in error with respect to Sargon, turned out to be the only written record which had kept before the world for above twenty-five centuries the name of one who in his day was the mightiest king upon the earth, and who now holds a place second to few in the long roll of Oriental sovereigns.

6. Zerah, the Ethiopian, who came against Asa, king of Judah, with an army of a million men, Cushites and Lubims (2 Chron. xvi. 8) was another monarch unknown to profane writers, whom the mythological interpreters consequently denounced as a pure "myth," the invention of the author of Chronicles. Recently, a royal name has been found in Ethiopia, which is read as Azerch-Amen, and appears to be that of a great conqueror. His inscriptions are referred by Brugsch and Lenormant to this date. The Zerah difficulty seems here to find its solution.

7. But the most plainly fictitious monarch, according to the "Mythologists," the one whom they were never tired of bringing forward and denouncing as unhistorical, was the Belshazzar of Daniel. Profane history, we were told, not only ignored him but precluded him. The list of the later Babylonian monarchs, as given by Berosus and Abydenus, was complete, and there was no Belshazzar among them. Daniel's whole account of his reign and of the taking of Babylon, was apocryphal. But in the year 1854, at Abu Shahrein, in lower Babylonia, cylinders of Nabonadius, the last native king of Babylon, were discovered; and on these M. Oppert in Babylonia, and Sir H. Rawlinson in England, read separately, almost at the same time, the name of Bel-shar-ezer, or Belshazzar, given as that of the monarch's eldest son, and introduced in a connexion from which both alike concluded that he must have been associated by his father in the government. Here then was the historical accuracy of the sacred writer which had been impugned, confirmed in the most striking way. The Belshazzar of Daniel was discovered—the whole history of the last siege and capture of Babylon was brought into perfect harmony and accord—all that profane historians, and all that Daniel related about it was consistent and might be presumed to be true—no contradiction was left between the sacred and the profane—the simple explanation of the apparent discord was that there were two kings reigning at the same time over the city, and that profane historians mentioned one, the father, while Daniel spoke of the other, the son.

8. The charges of inaccurate representations of manners and customs, and the answers to them, are matters of such extensive and such minute detail, that it is impossible for me now, after the warning bell has sounded, to enter upon them. Let me say, however, in conclusion, that the charge as regarded Egypt was met in great part by Hengstenberg in 1840 (*Ägypten und Mose*), and has since been completely answered in the "Speaker's Commentary"—that, as respects Babylon, it is triumphantly refuted by Dr. Pusey in his "Lectures upon Daniel,"—and that, as regards Persia, it is also met in the "Speaker's Commentary" (*Comment on Esther*) and

also in a small book of my own entitled "Historical Difficulties of the Old Testament."

I beg to thank the meeting for the attention with which it has heard me.

REV. CANON TRISTRAM, LL.D., F.R.S., Durham.

OUR topic is, "What definite result as to the interpretation of Scripture has been produced by recent discoveries?" The discoveries of archæology, whether monumental or historical, have affected the interpretation of Scripture in four aspects: -1, Ethnographical; 2, Historical; 3, Chronological; 4, Geographical and Topographical.

Their ethnographical import, being chiefly confined to the pre-Abrahamic times, I leave in the far more competent hands of Professor Rawlinson. The other three aspects affect the interpretation of the early Scriptures, whether pre-Abrahamic or post-Abrahamic. In all three aspects we knew nothing till very recently which could be looked upon as contemporary. We had only vague traditions, or the second-hand information of later ancient writers; so that profound investigators of primæval antiquity, such as Stanley Faber, had none of the mass of material, whether of archæological discovery or linguistic recovery, which is at our command to aid them in tracing the primitive history of man. The result is that, whether we turn to the so-called legendary epoch before the call of Abraham, or to the annalistic period following it, we now find ourselves confronted with a contemporary and sometimes a more ancient literature, amplifying, exaggerating, interpolating, but never absolutely contradicting, the terse narrative of Genesis.

I. Looking first of all at the historical revelations of the Assyrian tablets in the pre-Abrahamic period, the long series of records published in many volumes by the Biblical Archæological Society bring before us a complete Assyrian story of man from the Creation.

The story of the Creation and the Fall belongs to the upper, or *Akkad*, i.e. Cushite division of the country, and in their present form are, perhaps, not the earliest legends; but even these are, in their original form, at least two centuries older than Abraham, and six centuries older than Moses. The story of the Flood and the history of Nimrod were probably written in the south of Chaldæa, and are at least as early as B.C. 2000. But they were all traditions before committed to writing, and the traditions are much older still. We have an account of the original chaos. Then from chaos are generated monsters or demons, heaven, earth, and sea. We are told of the fall of the celestial being, who appears to correspond to Satan. There was war in heaven. The powers of evil were conquered. The gods in due course created the universe in the same succession as in the Mosaic narrative, at each stage pronouncing it good, the eighth tablet making the work culminate in the creation of man. And here, "the God," our God, is spoken of; while elsewhere the

Babylonian mythology is introduced, as though the archaic simplicity of primæval truth had been retained in this tablet alone, which was too sacred to be tampered with, even by the priesthood. Man is made upright, and endued with the faculty of speech. A long address is delivered by the Deity to man, impressing on him his duties; and to the woman her duties to her husband; and the pair are to be the companions of the gods.

Mr. G. Smith remarks:—"There is fair reason to suppose that there was a close agreement in subjects and order between the text of the Chaldean legend and Genesis, while there does not appear to be anything like the same agreement between these inscriptions and the accounts transmitted to us by Berosus."

Let us briefly note the points of identity. The first tablet, corresponding to Gen. i. 1, 2, begins:—

"When the upper region was not yet called heaven,
And the lower region was not yet called earth,
And the abyss of Hades had not yet opened its arms,
Then the chaos of waters gave birth to all of them,
And the waters were gathered into one place.
No men yet dwelt together, no animals yet wandered about;
None of the gods had yet been born,
Their names were not spoken, their attributes were not known."

Records of the Past, vol. ix., p. 117.

In another we have the creation of dry land; in the fifth we have the creation of the heavenly bodies with much detail, the moon being created before the sun. They are to be for signs, for seasons, for days, and for years. But more, it declares the Sabbath to have been ordained at the Creation. "On the seventh day He appointed a holy-day, and to cease from all business He commanded." But, as Mr. Fox Talbot remarks, "The account falls short of the majesty of the Hebrew Genesis, for it implies that the heavenly movements might possibly go wrong, and, therefore, the dwellings of the gods Hea and Bel are placed in the planets." The creation of the cattle of the field, the beasts of the field, and the creeping things, occurs as in Genesis.

We have the Fall. "The dragon Tiamat tempted Him. The god Hea heard and was angry, because his man had corrupted his purity." The curse is, "May he be conquered and at once cut off." On a seal two figures are seated by a tree holding out their hands to the fruit, while a serpent stands erect behind one of them.

Four rivers are spoken of as surrounding Gan-danu—i.e. Gan-Eden—the Garden of Eden—two of them the Tigris and Euphrates. Among the names of the Antediluvians occur Cain, Enoch, Cainan, Lamech, Tubal-Cain, or *Bil-kān*, the god of fire and melter of metals. The ten generations of Genesis are represented by ten successive kings. The translation of Enoch is placed after the Flood, and transferred to Noah.

Of the famous Izdubar legend, the Assyrian story of the Flood, I need not speak. Twenty-three points in the narrative of Genesis are given in the tablets, with some few discrepancies, enough to show that neither narrative was copied directly from the other.

We have the account of the building of the Tower of Babel, its interruption by Divine interposition for man's sin. "God destroyed in the night what they built in the day. He scattered them also, and made strange their speech, and Babylon was abandoned." Then comes the story of Nimrod, identified with the highest probability as the *Izdubar* of the tablets, for he founded Babel, Akkad, Erech, and Nipur, which has been shown to be another name for the Calneh of Genesis.

Mr. Smith writes:—"Izdubar forms the centre of the national historical poetry, just as Nimrod is stated to have been in the later traditions. I subsequently found that he agreed exactly in character with Nimrod; he was a giant hunter, according to the cuneiform legends, who contended with and destroyed the lion, tiger, leopard, and wild bull or buffalo, animals the most formidable in the chase in any country. He ruled first in Babylonia, over the region which from other sources we know to have been the centre of Nimrod's kingdom. He extended his dominion to the Armenian mountains, the boundary of his late conquests, according to tradition; and one principal scene of his exploits and triumphs was the city of Erech, which, according to Genesis, was the second capital of Nimrod."

The discovery by Mr. Loftus, and identification of, Ur, with its innumerable inscriptions, its bricks stamped with the name of Arioch (Gen. xiv. 1), and its temples to the moon god and other idols, bring down the exhumed Assyrian annals to the time of Abraham.

What, then, is the definite result as to Scripture history? Certainly that there is not an incident touched on from primæval chaos to the call of Abraham which is not illustrated and confirmed by the utterances of a language which speaks again after a silence of four thousand years, though we have only just begun to gather a few fragments from its storehouses. The ingenuity of a destructive criticism can avail nothing against this. Subtle intellects have endeavoured to evolve from their inner consciousness the theory of differing Jehovistic and Elohistical originals put together in later ages to form the early chapters of Genesis, and shallow copyists have assumed this as an accepted axiom of scholarship. But historical facts dissipate philological hypotheses. The cylinders of Assyria expand in the same series the so-called Jehovistic and Elohistical portions alike.

We have been told that the Pentateuch, in its present shape, was compiled by Samuel, by the later Seers, or by Ezra. But now it is no longer possible to suggest any origin later than the date of the Exodus for the history of Genesis, for to the Jews of the later period of Samuel the records of Assyria were inaccessible, and the structure of the language of Genesis is too archaic to be postponed to the period of the Captivity. We have been told that Gen. i. to ii. 3 is a fragment of an old Elohistical document, but Gen. ii. 4 to iii., a Jehovistic later document. The story of the Flood is Elohistical, of the dispersion of Babel is Jehovistic. Can the champions of this subjective criticism explain on their hypothesis of the double authorship how we find the Elohistical and Jehovistic portions alike successively embodied in the series of Assyrian records? This

simple fact brushes away a whole cloud of flimsy cobwebs laboriously woven to raise man's uncertainties above God's certainty.

Amid the controversies on the origin and meaning of the Sabbath, we now know that it was no Mosaic invention, no exclusively Semitic observance, not even an ordinance delivered to Abraham to separate his family from surrounding idolatry, but a primæval tradition, recognised, be it noted, by the Hamite contemporaries of Nimrod, as instituted from the Creation. We have thus another definite result that evidence is afforded that the Sabbath was recognised as a Divine institution before the separation of the Hamite and Semitic families of man, and that the obligation of its observance was acknowledged by both families.

The Assyrian records prove to us that the pre-Abrahamic history was not a vision, revealing to Moses facts of which he was heretofore ignorant, but a simple monotheistic relation of a continuous story of the earth and of man's origin, which in a corrupted form had actually at that time long existed in writing. Again, these are not Semitic traditions. They did not belong to the family of Abraham exclusively, but are shown to be, in their oldest hitherto discovered form, Akkadian—*i.e.* Cushite, or Hamite, a further evidence that the primæval knowledge was not limited to the Semitic progenitors of Israel. Nor could the legends have percolated from Assyria to Palestine before the later days of the monarchy. Between Chaldæa and Palestine was a wide extent of country, inhabited by very distinct and antagonistic nations, the Aramæan and the Hittite, races which have passed away. Abraham must have brought the basis of the early history of Genesis from that cradle of literature, Ur of the Chaldees, the city of Arioch. And I take it that the reasonable view of inspiration is, not that God dictated each word to Moses, but that the writer was supernaturally guided to indite that alone which was historic truth.

But did a monotheistic writer simply take the legend, and eliminate the polytheistic portions? No; for the variations between the accounts show that though they may be derived from a common origin, they are certainly not derived the one from the other. What, then, was the common origin of the Hamite or Akkadian cylinders, and of the Mosaic history? There surely can be none later than the accounts imparted by the common father of Shem, Ham and Japhet, before the dispersion of mankind. These accounts may have been oral, they may even have been written, for the perfection to which the art of inscribing had arrived so soon after Nimrod may well lead us to believe that it was an art transmitted from across the waters of the Deluge.

Are the great events alike recorded in both histories to be accepted as historical facts, or are we, at the bidding of those who would reject all, because of the marvellous element interwoven, to believe that the compilers intended, by the early story of mankind, to give us figurative and elaborate descriptions of natural phenomena? We reply in the pungent words of Mr. G. Smith: "If this were true, the myth would have taken to create it, a genius almost as great as that of the philosophers who explain it."

II. But when from the historical we pass to the chronological results of recent research, we must frankly admit many difficulties. From Nimrod or Izdubar downwards the chronology now stands scarcely disputed. Bishop Ussher and the modern Assyrian scholars agree in placing him about B.C. 2250. The difficulty is in the antecedent period from the Flood to his date, for which the received chronology allows only a century. But we can scarcely conceive so vast a multiplication of mankind in the space of three generations, even if we compress the whole into the valleys of the Euphrates and the Tigris, as is evidenced by the history and works of Nimrod.

The Elamite conquest of Chaldæa (Gen. xii.) is frequently alluded to in the tablets, and scholars agree in placing it about B.C. 2400, one hundred and fifty or two hundred years before Nimrod. But before it we have the tradition of thirty-six successive kings from the Flood. If accepted at all, we may fairly allow one thousand years for this succession, which would place the Flood about B.C. 3500, or one thousand years earlier than the popular chronology. This position would solve all difficulties. And bearing in mind that succession, not chronology, is the object of the narrative, and that in the Hebrew and other Semitic tongues there are no distinct words for the degrees of genealogy, the statement that Cush was the son of Ham, and Nimrod the son of Cush, need bear no closer interpretation than that Nimrod was descended from Ham through Cush.

When we see how genealogies are notoriously compressed, as in Matt. i., for technical convenience, and find that the Akkadian cylinders compress them in the same way, and likewise use the same word for "son" and "descendant," we are entitled, I submit, to allow a period of indefinite extension, if other circumstances require it, for the dispersion and gradual increase of mankind after the Flood. When Moses was supernaturally inspired dimly to sketch the great events and epochs of a far-reaching Past, those great epochs towered one behind the other, as the traveller on the plains of India sees hundreds of miles away the peaks of the mighty Himalayan range in close array rising one behind the other, and his eye marks each in succession, without taking note of the vast plains and wide uplands that intervene hidden and buried between each. So it is beneath the standpoint of our faith to measure inspiration by applying the cold, bald precision of western criticism to the figurative expressions and vivid metaphors which are the natural outcome of oriental thought, or to measure it by the position of a dot or a point in the Hebrew numerals.

III. When from the historical we proceed to that eye of history, the geographical and topographical details of the early Scriptures, our attention is directed chiefly to the journal of the wanderings of the Exodus, and the allotment of the Land of Promise. These are full of topographical notes on the Sinaitic Peninsula, and the various countries east of Jordan, while the Domesday Book of Joshua describes with the fulness of a government survey the various tribal boundaries, and contains long lists of the towns and villages allotted to each tribe. Till recently these countries had

never been accurately surveyed. Geographical precision and strong local colouring we find to pervade the whole narrative; and the events circumstantially recorded in Exodus are of such a character, that on the acceptance of them as historical facts depends the whole question of the truth of the Old Testament.

The recent surveys of the Sinaitic Peninsula have shown the most exact accordance of the record of the Exodus with existing topographical facts, an accordance which would be inconceivable unless the history were compiled at the time. Mr. Holland's researches have shown that at that very date the mining region north-east of Suez was occupied by strong Egyptian garrisons, and that the Israelites could have taken no other route than the southern one between Jebel er Rahah and the Red Sea. Then, after crossing the Red Sea, we have Ayûn Mûsa (Moses's wells), then three days' journey without water, then the bitter springs of Marah (Ain Hawarah), then Elim (Wady Gharandel), with its palmtrees and vegetation still existing. From Elim they go back to the sea, and follow down the coast. Then, where a bold headland forbids further progress, "they removed from the Red Sea and encamped in the wilderness of Sin,"—*i.e.* when the headland Ras Abu Zenimeh forbids further passage, they turn inland and double it. Thence only one road, Wady Taiyebah which, with their baggage, the Israelites could have taken towards Sinai, with two halting-places by the way. Here Mr. Holland has traced Rephidim, and beyond the pass the old circular huts of an extinct race, the Amalekites, with their hearthstones and remains of bones and charred wood. In the open space we find every condition required for the delivery of the law from Sinai, and also for the details of the battle of Rephidim.

Eastward from Sinai, again, at a distance of three days' journey, Professor Palmer discovered a piece of ground covered for many acres with the stone circles which mark the site of camps, but of a different shape from any now in use. The hearthstones were still there, and pieces of charcoal beneath the surface. Stretching to a great distance round the camps were numbers of grave-mounds, said by the Arabs to be the remains of a vast pilgrim caravan, which pitched here ages ago, and was afterwards lost in the desert of the Tih. No doubt remained on the mind of the explorers that they were actually on the site of Kibroth Hattaavah, and that their fingers, as they turned the stone heaps, were grimed with the dust of them that lusted. Exactly a day's journey further on they discovered the wells and romantic oasis of Ain Hudherah, the Arabic equivalent for Hazereth.*

If beyond this each halting-place prior to the 38th year of the wanderings has not been traced and identified, it is simply because from the nature of the case it is most unlikely that names, probably given at the time by the travellers themselves to featureless camping-grounds, should have been preserved. But the latter part of the wanderings has been traced with the same accuracy as the earlier. The discovery by Mr. Holland only this year of a labyrinth

* Palmer's Desert of the Exodus, vol. ii., p. 257.

of valleys, slopes, roads, and hilly country in the north of the desert of Tih, in the region just south of Ain Gades, recognised as Kadesh Barnea, solves the difficulties connected with the protracted sojourn of a vast host for many years in this region. Proceeding from the watershed of Jebel et Tih northward through Jebel Mugrah, Mr. Holland found what seems to have afforded the road known as "the way of the spies," a wide region full of traces of ancient habitations and cultivation. West of this region he has traced an easy, direct, and well-watered route to Egypt, with wells and ancient ruins, and numbers of flint-flakes and arrow-heads, proving that it was a road much used in very early times, while large tracts of land are still cultivated. The pass of Akrabbim, the mountain of the Amorites, Zephath, and Harmah—none of these are now mere traditional names, but actual recognised sites, where the march of Israel can be most distinctly traced.

I need not further trace the later history of Numbers and Deuteronomy, the minute details of all the movements of Israel round Edom, through Moab, and to the plains of Shittim, or the high places of Balak and Balaam, as on a former occasion I have been permitted to bring the explorations of myself and others before the notice of the Congress. Thus, entering into Palestine itself, with the Book of Joshua in our hands, we scarcely need a further guide.

The officers of the Palestine Exploration Fund have laid down in that ordnance map, which in a few weeks will be in your hands, 2770 names where previously only 450 were laid down. Of all the long catalogues of Joshua, there is scarce a village, however insignificant, which does not retain for its desolate heap or its modern hovels the Arabic equivalent for the name written down by Joshua 3300 years ago. But it is not merely the continuance by an "occult Providence" of the names in the very places where they ought by the Record to be; it is the little touches which often startle by the way in which they carry conviction of the time and place of the sacred penman. Thus, when we read that Abraham's second encampment was on a "mountain east of Bethel, and that he pitched his tent, having Bethel on the west and Hai on the east, and there he builded an altar," and when between the site of Bethel and the desolate heap, the "Tell" of Ai, we observe a valley, and in its centre a lofty hill with undecipherable ruins on its summit, whence and whence alone a view of the Jordan valley and the head of the Dead Sea is obtained, we know exactly where Abraham stood and where the writer placed him.

Thus is proof and illustration rapidly accumulating; and one definite result is certainly this, that hostile criticism must for the future be subjective and not objective. If there be a corroborated and illustrated history of the world, we have it here. The solvent of unbelief cannot dissolve the sculptured stones and burnt tablets of Chaldæa. But Scepticism, like other organisms, may still preserve her continuity, while, Proteus-like, she develops new forms by a process of evolution; that theory which its votaries, as we read in the *Nineteenth Century* for July, tell us is universally accepted by

all thinking and educated men, while in the same breath they admit that the proofs are not forthcoming, and that it is not reasonable to expect they should be. The historical assault has been triumphantly repulsed all along the line. We calmly await the next charge; for "*Magna est veritas et prævalebit.*"

Mr. W. R. COOPER, F.R.A.S., M.R.A.S., Hon. Secretary
of the Society of Biblical Archæology.

THE last few years, though they have witnessed a great revival in the pursuits of Egyptian and Assyrian Archæology, have, it must be confessed, yielded but negative results for the advancement of Biblical criticism. Several very long and important texts have been deciphered—texts which are important chiefly from a scientific point of view, the principal of these being the Harris Historical and the Ebers Medical Papyri, both of them being the largest and most perfect examples extant of their respective classes of hieroglyphic literature. Unfortunately these Papyri have no direct bearing upon theological topics, and I prefer therefore to confine my remarks to the interpretation of the cuneiform inscriptions of Babylonia and Chaldea alone. In the department of Assyrian decipherment some very valuable discoveries have quite recently been made—discoveries having a most serious connection with ancient sacred history, and which discoveries it must not be disguised are capable of receiving an interpretation adverse to the authenticity of Holy Writ, and which, consequently, we are bound to examine the more carefully. Let me briefly recall to your mind what these discoveries are.

On the 3rd December, 1872, the late George Smith read before the Society of Biblical Archæology the startling Chaldean narrative of the Noachic deluge, a narrative which he had just translated from a neglected Assyrian tablet in the British Museum. This ancient document was at once accepted as a corroboration of one of the most disputed events in the early history of mankind, and on the face of the narrative there was every reason to believe that it afforded such a desirable confirmation. The interest thus aroused in Assyrian decipherment was very considerable. Both in England and on the Continent the first Semitic scholars devoted their energies to the elucidation of further texts. The subsequent expeditions of Mr. Smith to Nineveh presented us with many additional materials, and after about two years' examination and collection of the fragments of inscriptions obtained and compared with each other, the following deductions were almost indisputably proved:—1. That the Deluge Tablet was the eleventh of a series of twelve tablets containing the history of a solar hero-king named Izdubar, whose adventures had reference to the Zodiacal signs of the different months of the Chaldean year. 2. That of this eleventh tablet there existed several copies of two totally distinct versions, written, the one by a maritime people, the other by a pastoral one, and that these two versions

contained only their leading incidents in common. 3. That the other tablets of the series contained accounts of the Creation of man, of the war of the evil spirits, and of the destruction of the tower of Babel, together with other events pertaining rather to Talmudic than Biblical literature. Besides these there were other series of tablets, containing accounts of the destruction of the Cities of the Plain, of the creation of two distinct races of mankind, the white and the dark, of the kingdom of the underworld, and of the water of immortality. These latter legends did not belong to the Izdubar cycle, and their narratives produced some curious analogies with the mythologies of the Aryan nations.

Now, all these legends, for such in their Assyrian version they assuredly are, whatever might have been their origin, were found to exist in various forms, of which the oldest types were lost, and they possessed just those differences which showed that they belonged to a collection of traditions common to both the Turanian and Semitic peoples, and having much affinity also with the mythologies of the Indo-Germanic races. Now, it must be remembered that for one point where the Biblical and Chaldean narratives agreed there were many more where they differed, the Chaldean possessing more picturesqueness of detail and the Biblical the greater simplicity; the elements of the marvellous and the supernatural were features present in both. Another thing to be borne in mind is that, as already stated of all or most of these legends, there were two Chaldean versions, and of these two versions one had a more Monotheistic character than the other, and that generally the Polytheistic account was the better preserved. Besides all this, the progress of criticism proved that of these two very old Chaldean versions we possessed not the original texts for criticism, but only copies of them, made by the order of Assurbanipal, King of Assyria, about 700 B.C., while the copies thus made were stated on the tablets themselves to be faithfully translated from the originals, whose date was about the second millenium before our era: yet these very Assyrian copyists were proved on examination to have mistaken many signs and misunderstood the meaning of many sentences in the ancient version which they professed to have transcribed along with their own translation into the latter Assyrian. Here, then, arose a great textual difficulty. Had there been no other records of the Chaldean account of Genesis than that which had been written out by the scribes of Assurbanipal at a comparatively recent date, it would have been very easy to have accounted for the difference between the Biblical and the Chaldean narratives on the ground of a corruption of tradition, and to have worked out of those very discrepancies an evidence of the truth of the Mosaic record. Unfortunately for this theory, however, there exist a large number of indisputably most ancient Babylonian cylinders dating from a period prior to that of Moses, and the figures upon these cylinders generally represent scenes taken from the Izdubar legends in their most corrupt form. Thus was a subject for enquiry opened up, and before very long unorthodox critics, and chief of the number, Dr. Goldziher, produced a theory in which was maintained with considerable ability

that almost all the historical personages in the Pentateuch, and several also of those in the book of Judges, more especially the suffete Samson, were either disguised representatives of the Aryan nature-gods or of the ancient solar Semitic mythology of which the Izdubar legends presented the latter form. This position, if it could have been substantiated, would have proved seriously damaging not only to Jewish but Christian theology, since with the destruction of the personality of the heroes of the Old Testament history would follow as a corollary the falsification of all the doctrinal tenets and spiritual lessons of which they were the accepted types. Fortunately, however, for orthodoxy, the German professor, and still more his followers, pressed these analogies too far, and just as Cox's "*Mythology of the Aryan Nations*" has, quite unwittingly on the author's part, reduced Vedism to an absurdity, so the attempts made in Goldziher's "*Mythology among the Hebrews*" to associate all the Biblical histories with Aryan or Chaldean legends has begun to show itself overdrawn. Mahaffey, in "*Kottabos*," has made the nature myths contradict themselves, and yet include every person or circumstance past and present, even blending in one person Max Müller and his life-long adversary Weber as types of the sun. The truth is that where history had to depend upon unwritten testimony, every great character has had his biography drawn with double portraiture. Baring-Gould has clearly proven that the Charlemagne of history and of romance are entirely different individuals—the one purely fictitious and embodying the beliefs of a popular ideal, a syncretised national myth in fact, while the other is a well-defined hero and legislator, whose acts have been exaggerated, and whose story has become absorbed into that of the more popular and symbolic king. The same principle is equally true of King Arthur, of the Cid, of William Tell, and of William Wallace, and the mental progress is still in our days legendising the lives of two totally opposed warriors, the First Napoleon and the peasant Andreas Hofer. In this fact lies the true solution of the problem originated by the Assyrian Tablets, and herein is indicated the line of argument to be adopted by the defenders of our faith against German mysticists or English neologians. In Ancient Chaldea there was a tolerably complex mythological system founded on a solar basis with which their own heroes were identified. In early Hebrew history there were certain famous personages who figured in the records of Chaldea also. When the great Semitic races separated, these same personages still remained fixed in the annals of their respective histories—histories which were religions also. But in the system of the one people, Adam, Noah, Abraham, and Samson gradually lost their position as men and became absorbed into the mythological traditions of the country, while in the other the same characters remained distinct as individuals, being preserved from legendary degradation by the severity of a monotheistic religion and the restraints of an inflexible ritual compiled to perpetuate the memory of the national events in which they not as gods but men took part. This preservative against idealism, which was always in force while the Jewish sacerdotal system flourished, lost its influence

as the strength of that system decayed on the transportation of the ten tribes to Babylon, the home of the contrary myths. Henceforth there was ever in the minds of the most orthodox a struggle to reconcile the two representations, and when the vast body of traditions out of which the Talmud was formed was collected by the Jewish Rabbis just returned from exile, the compilers, unable to discriminate between the true and the false, allowed many Chaldean errors to creep into their work, while to give a proper significance to the variations thus sanctioned to the text of the Pentateuch, they added an hyper-spiritual explanation of their symbolism, adopting an hypothesis which if allowed to prevail would orthodoxise the most erotic poetry, and give a doctrinal significance or prophetic meaning, both to the most incongruous imaginations of a diseased mind and the coarsest and wildest pagan legends.

On the principle that it is always best to be beforehand with one's possible antagonists, some notice must be taken of the Egibi tablets in connection with the history of the earlier portion of the book of Daniel. These tablets, upwards of five thousand in number, are the official contracts and memoranda of a firm of Assyrian bankers of very long standing and of the highest reputation, and who were moreover connected with the royal treasury. The tablets, which as usual are of baked clay, range from the first year of Nebuchadnezzar to the thirty-fifth of Darius, thus covering the whole of the period with which the books of Nehemiah, Daniel, Haggai, and Zechariah have to do. Of the chronological position of Darius *the Mede* it is not necessary now to speak; it is yet quite uncertain who and what he was. What is, however, essential for us to consider is, that there was evidently no long interregnum in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. This is proved by the dates of the Egibi tablets, and we do not find in the extant inscriptions of this monarch any such a change in his actions or mind as to produce such a proclamation as that copied out in Daniel iii., while at the same time not only is the tenor of the decree in direct opposition to anything recorded of the great king, but its language is idiomatically opposed to that employed in the royal declarations, many of which are still existing. How, then, is this difficulty reasonably to be disposed of? Only, I fancy, by some such an argument as this. If there were no actual interregnum during Nebuchadnezzar's madness, or if that madness were only of short duration, there would, of course, be no record of it in the official documents. A parallel case you will all recollect took place in the reign of George III., during whose severe mental aberrations prior to the Regency, all the Acts of Parliament were dated in regular succession. The difference of the language of the King of Babylon's decree, if it were ever a published one, may perhaps be explained by assuming that the scribe in the book of Daniel gives the purport, and not the very words, of the royal proclamation, or that it was a proclamation promulgated in the cities of the Jews only.

These are not the only difficulties which will be forced upon us by the discovery of the Egibi tablets. There are others quite as perplexing. According to the book of Daniel, Daniel and his three

companions were made chiefs of certain large districts by Darius, while to himself was given the governorship of the province of Babylon. Now the Egibi and Contract tablets give the names as witnesses of many of the chief officers of state and the governors of many of the royal provinces as well as that of Babylon, and that from Belshazzar to Darius; but among the hundreds of names thus preserved neither in their Chaldean form of Belshazzar, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, nor yet in the Hebrew ones of Ananias, Azarias, and Mishol, have the names of Daniel and his companions been found. True we are not yet in possession of a complete list of all the Babylonian and Perso-Babylonian governors and officials; but as amongst the names at present recorded many of obviously Jewish origin occur, it does not, to speak more strongly, suggest a serious obstacle to the authenticity of the book of Daniel that the personages mentioned in it as occupying an important part in Babylonish history do not seem to be mentioned in official documents contemporary with them. It is a want of accuracy similar to this which has destroyed the credibility of the Apochryphal book of Judith. Perhaps our best position in relation to this difficulty is not to be too prompt in attempting to reply to it, at least till the whole of the Egibi tablets have been examined. Remember that they are five thousand in number, and range over the period of a century and a half, or, more exactly, one hundred and sixty-five years. When this has been done Biblical critics will be better able to know what deductions they have to meet, and what arguments can be drawn from the data laid before them, data which cannot be underrated or ignored.

Before quitting this part of my subject I beg to draw your attention, or rather warn our younger friends against an error into which Christian apologists are often led, the error of supporting a fairly strong argument by a weak or unsound, if plausible premise. However much devout but uncritical readers may esteem his book, Professor Porter has done much harm to his really sound views upon other points by his unscientific description of the remains of Herodian or Roman buildings in the Holy Land to the founders of the "Giant City of Bucham." The Rev. C. Forster is another instance of a well-intentioned author, who has nullified the effect of all his other writings by adhering to a repeatedly disproved translation of the Himyaritic and Egyptian inscriptions. It is a subject of regret that his errors should have been followed, not without warning, by Dr. Rule, who, in his recently published "*Oriental Records*," adheres to the same absurd theses; and therefore neo-Christian scholars who well know the worthlessness of one part of his argument, of which they can judge for themselves, will impute, very erroneously and injuriously for Christian interests, the like valuelessness to the rest of his book which deals with facts of which they are not fair critics. The late J. W. Bosanquet, in his "*Messiah the Prince*," relied very much upon the evidential testimony of certain Jewish gravestones in the Crimea. These have since been known to have been forged by a Jew named Firkorvitch, and the author in the last edition of his book very prudently withdrew from

it this portion of his defence, which depended upon the dates of the Jewish tombstones. In the department of Egyptian literature the Exodus papyri of Dr. Laüth, and Dunbar Heath, and the Beni-Hassan Israelites of Dr. Haigh, are generally concluded by Egyptologists to be very uncertainly translated; and when, therefore, popular clerical writers, whose books in other respects possess high evidential value, associate with true supports such rotten props as these, the whole fabric of proof which they had intended to raise upon them falls to the ground, and the cause of religion is weakened by zeal overruling credulity. Beware, gentlemen, of what is plausible. The Anglo-Israel movement, and Pyramid Metrology theories, when they have died out, as all such fallacies sooner or later will do, will be found to have scarred the fair body of evidential theology. Beware: archæology in religious matters has almost always proven that when an argument or discovery is very good at first sight it will turn out on examination to be good for nothing, while, be it remembered, one unnecessary proof disproved, more reaches the ear of the world than nineteen other deductions left untouched. Forgive me, "fathers," if I urge that we must be careful indeed of this tempting danger.

Throughout this paper I have preferred to dwell upon the results which can receive an interpretation adverse to orthodox faith, because of this character are the most recent Assyriological discoveries; else, had it been otherwise, I would have observed that despite these discrepancies, perhaps only apparent ones, there are a number of little incidental points relating to manners and customs, but bearing upon matters of faith, which have received illustration from Assyrian researches. Of these are—1. The theory of Mr. Sharpe, that the account of the battle of the kings with Abraham was invented for religious purposes in the time of the kings. This idea, which was eagerly caught up by the German schools, is disproved by the mention in the cuneiform inscriptions of the kingdom of Elam, as a principal one, fully two thousand years B.C., while the half-mythical Chederlaomer is easily to be recognised in the deified king Kudur Lagamar, who is mentioned in the early annals of Babylonia. 2. The same argument may be applied to the asserted late date of the Levitical legislation among the Jews, since an almost similar code of laws existed in Chaldea in the time of the Patriarchs. 3. The Elohistic controversy has benefited by the researches, for we now find that proper names compounded of Yah and Ela are of equal antiquity, and the tributary position of the Jewish kingdom in the days of Hezekiah and Josiah is proven not to have had that potential crushing out of national life which was the characteristic of the Roman power. While we confine our attention principally to historical points we are pretty nearly sure of support from the Cuneiform inscriptions. It is only when the student of Biblical archæology is too eagerly searching for doctrinal evidences that he becomes confused, and injures the progress of faith by unsound inferences drawn from false analogies.

There is one department of Assyriology which has only lately begun to be explored, which has not yielded any negative results so

far as faith is concerned, and from which much assistance in Biblical criticism may be expected. That department is philology. In curious contradistinction to their Egyptian contemporaries, the Assyrians were as a nation much devoted to linguistic science. The Assyrian excavations have produced hundreds of grammatical and syllabic tablets and portions of dictionaries. The Egyptian Papyri, as far as they have been read, do not contain one, though it is certain from the memoranda on the Egyptian workmen's tools as contrasted with the nailmarks of the Assyrian householders, that education was far more universally spread along the banks of the Nile than the shores of the Euphrates. Most of the Assyrian philological tablets date from the reign of Assurbanipal, a time when the older form of writing and speaking was already obsolete, and therefore it had become necessary to draw up lists of duplicate words for the common use of the scribes. These syllabic tablets and tables of variant readings are calculated to throw considerable light on the formation of the early Semitic languages, and on the idiom of Biblical Hebrew in particular. Mingled with these verbal lists are also vocabularies of the names of plants, animals, and minerals, and geographical tribute lists enumerating the various productions of the different provinces of the empire and of the tributary states, and among the names of places thus handed down to posterity are many which occur in the Old Testament, and which have hitherto been only vaguely identified. Most important also are the etymological inferences which arise out of a comparison of the translation and transliteration of Accadian, Assyrian, and Hebrew proper names, both personal and geographical. All this, however, belongs to a branch of learning of which I am not competent to speak, and the fruits of which, and the processes whereby they are obtained, are so entirely technical as to be unintelligible out of the quietude of the study. From these philological investigations much has been picked out, but the full sheaf of information has yet to be gathered; and it is a matter of sincere congratulation to the friends of the English Church that it counts amongst its members the best past, and the most promising of present, Assyriologists. In such an assembly as I am now addressing, it would be superfluous for me more distinctly to refer to Canon Rawlinson and Professors Houghton and Sayce.

In conclusion, I fear the tone of this paper may disappoint and perhaps alarm a few timid brethren: perhaps it may even excite the anger of some sturdier champions of the faith. But in truth there is little occasion for either apprehension or distrust. Experience has proven that in matters of faith all forms of research are at first accepted as friendly, then regarded as hostile, and lastly left to themselves as indifferent to revelation. Owing chiefly to the very imperfect condition of our Assyrian materials, and the extreme tendency that modern thought has of speculating in analogies, the science of comparative Mythology has been extended beyond its proper sphere, and its results unduly exaggerated. What is more necessary than a comparison of myths is a discovery of their origin. Some are external to man, and are impressed upon him by circum-

stances ; others are evoked out of his own instincts, appetites, and passions, but there still remain sentiments, not theories, which cannot be accounted for, which are better and higher than mankind, and even antagonistic to its instincts, and these must be divine ; while there are also events and personages whose lives have too many points of verisimilitude about them to be wholly fictitious, and which may be disguised by, but cannot be resolved into, myths of an era subsequent to their own. Holding the shield of faith on our arm and the sword of the spirit in our hand, let us passively, but not unpreparedly, wait the opening up of the mounds of Assyria, whether those excavations seem to prove either the trenches of an enemy or the outworks of a friend. Nothing is at present so much to be deprecated as undue haste either to attack or defend, and nothing is more dangerous than a rash confidence in the impregnability of our own position, or an ignorance of the apparent forces that can be brought against it by forces which an unruffled scrutiny will possibly show to be like a Chinese regiment, more alarming than effectual.

DISCUSSION.

The LORD BISHOP OF OHIO.

It is only because my lord bishop appealed to my loyalty as an episcopalian that I consented to speak ; for my brethren to whom I speak will remember that your lordship said that you would not wish to hear—and I quite agreed with him—anyone but an expert ; and an expert I am not. But this is what I wanted him to say, but he refused, and therefore I must say it—that in his opening remarks he omitted to say that these discoveries, which interest us so much, are known in our country as well as in yours. He stated that these discoveries were the subject of deep interest in England, and excited almost as much attention on the Continent of Europe, but he omitted—I know not for what reason—the Continent of America and the United States of America and Canada, where certainly these books have been read with as deep interest as by any who speak the English language. My lord, nearly 25 years ago, the first discoveries of Canon Rawlinson furnished to me the foundation of certainly some of the most valuable, and, to my congregation I think, the most interesting, remarks upon the evidence of Scripture they have ever heard from my lips. Canon Rawlinson's translation of the "History of Herodotus" is the standard book at Kenyon College. My friend, Canon Tristram's book I know is as widely read in America as it is in England, and I think I can testify that he has received, as far as profits are concerned, about as much from America as he has from England. This is what I wanted to say, my lord, for the honour of my country, that we are deeply interested in everything that will form a record of the Word of God.

Rev. W. F. BIRCH, Rector of St. Saviour's, Manchester.

A PREVIOUS speaker has referred to the Palestine Exploration Fund. The committee of that fund has spent many thousands of pounds in excavations at Jerusalem and in making a survey of the western part of the Holy Land. They want now more money to make further explorations, so that they may discover in Galilee the position of Capernaum, Bethsaida, and other towns.

The subject before us is "the *definite* results as to the interpretation of Scripture produced by discoveries in Egypt, Nineveh, Palestine, and the Catacombs of Rome." I take the discoveries in Palestine. I have alluded to excavations already made by Captain Warren, and wish to refer to two of the discoveries made at Jerusalem as leading to very *definite* results.

We ought to have a map to properly explain them, but for want of it let us take one of those banners hanging in the hall. We will take the Union Jack as representing the site of Jerusalem as it originally was. On the right-hand side is the Valley of the Kidron; on the left and bottom of it, that is, on the west and south side, is another valley.

Those two join at the bottom corner on the right-hand side. That is how the valleys of Jerusalem appear now. Captain Warren discovered that there was a *deep* valley, which is mentioned by Josephus, running through the middle of Jerusalem. The oblique stripe extending from the right-hand bottom corner to the centre of the flag, and thence the horizontal stripe, reaching to the left side, will serve to represent its course.

Now we are told in the Bible that Jerusalem was somewhere on the boundary between Judah and Benjamin, as in Joshua xv. 8,—“the border went up by the valley of the son of Hinnom, unto the south side of the Jebusite.” Accordingly the valley on the west and south has been commonly taken to be the valley of Hinnom. This, however, it cannot possibly be, for it may be clearly proved from the Bible that Jerusalem was partly in Judah and partly in Benjamin.

In Joshua xviii. 28, it is said to be in the latter tribe; while in Judges i. 3, 8, Judah said unto Simeon,—“Come up with me into *my* lot;” and then they went against *Jerusalem*.

These two passages, as well as others, shew that the city was divided between the two tribes.

The W. and S. valley, therefore, cannot be the valley of Hinnom, for such a boundary would put Jerusalem *entirely* in the tribe of Benjamin.

Again, the valley on the East, that of the Kidron, has been taken to be the valley of Hinnom.

But to this there is a further and not less serious objection. The Jews were very particular in the use of words, and described different kinds of valleys by different names. In Hebrew the valley of Hinnom is always called Gai, and the valley of Kidron, Nachal.

Gai and Nachal denote valleys of different characters and therefore, according to this distinction, the valley of the Kidron cannot be the valley of Hinnom. This peculiarity of use has been acknowledged by writers of great eminence. Canon Williams, in his “Holy City,” states that he “has misgivings” in disregarding it. The only valley remaining, that running through Jerusalem and called by Josephus the Tyropœon valley, must therefore be the valley of Hinnom.

It is remarkable that Jerome speaks of the valley of Hinnom, though he never mentions the Tyropœon. Half a century ago Dr. Clarke asserted that part of ancient Jerusalem was on the south side of the W. and S. valley. This statement

was strange enough and wrong, but he had the right idea in his mind, viz., that the valley of Hinnom ran through Jerusalem, though he had not the benefit of Captain Warren's discovery to lead him to a right conclusion.

But someone may say, "If the W. and S. valley was not the valley of Hinnom, what was it called? It is very surprising for it not to be mentioned in the Bible."

If now we look at the 31st chapter of Jeremiah, 38-40, we have just what we want, for we find described in a *circuit* how the city should afterwards be built "from the tower of Hananeel unto the gate of the corner . . . and the whole valley of the dead bodies . . . unto the brook Kidron."

Here the valley of Hinnom, passing *through* the city, ought, of course, not to be mentioned, and actually is not; but the W. and S. valley ought naturally to be spoken of, and is doubtless named as the "valley of the dead bodies," while, be it observed, the Hebrew word for *valley* in this case is neither Gai nor Nachal, but another word, Emek.

Thus recent discoveries have brought us to this *definite* result,—that we know at last *for certain* where the valley of Hinnom was, and what were the proper names of the three valleys of Jerusalem. The proof amounts to demonstration, and so we conclude that the Kidron is always called Nachal, the central valley always Gai, the W. and S. valley always Emek.

We expect this distinction to suit all passages relating to the valleys of Jerusalem; and if in any case a difficulty arises, something must be wrong.

The prophet Joel, iii. 12, speaks of the valley of Jehoshaphat, obviously close to Jerusalem. The word used is Emek. Therefore he refers to the W. and S. valley bounded at its western extremity by the fertile cornfields of the valley of Rephaim, and at its eastern end by the king's wine presses. This exactly suits the mention of the "harvest" and "wine press" in the 13th verse.

In Jeremiah xxi. 13, the words,—“I am against thee, O inhabitant of the valley, and rock of the plain,” are taken to refer to Jerusalem. Here the word for *valley* is Emek, and for *plain*, Mishor, a term applied only to the upland downs east of the Jordan. The mention of the Emek as inhabited, when in fact the W. and S. valley was never inhabited, would shew that our conclusion was wrong if these words really applied to Jerusalem; but the second word, “Mishor,” comes to our help, and renders it certain that some place on the E. side of the Jordan is really referred to. A comparison of this passage with the 4th verse of the 49th chapter, and with the 21st chapter of Ezekiel, makes it plain that the reference is to Rabbath Ammon, with its well-watered valley and conspicuous citadel. Thus a second *definite* result, as to the correct application of prophecy, follows from the discovery of the true valley of Hinnom.

REV. BROWNLOW MAITLAND.

CALLED on by you, my lord bishop, to address a few remarks without preparation to this meeting on the subject before us, I desire to say at once that I have no special knowledge of it, have never prosecuted any original researches into Biblical antiquity, do not even know a letter of the arrow-headed alphabet, and that the Rosetta stone is to me—well, it is the Rosetta stone! But I am sure that the discoveries of which we have been hearing are of extreme interest, as everything must be which throws light on God's holy scriptures. They show us the writers of the Old Testament in a vivider light, as really dwelling amidst the scenes they describe, knowing the events taking place around them, and clothing their narratives with the very colour and costume of their respective periods. We

thus attain a clearer impression of their antiquity and genuineness, and a fuller confidence in their veracity. At the same time I was conscious of a wish—I hope not a very wicked one—that we could have heard something of the other side of these questions; could in fact have had a sort of *Advocatus Diaboli* to raise a discussion, and enable us outsiders to see what might be said by a sceptical opponent. What I wish, however, specially to say is this, that these critical controversies, however interesting and important, do not and cannot touch any vital point of our faith. I wish for a moment to call you to a higher region where our faith has its true source, and which no criticism, historical, antiquarian, philological, or any other can ever reach; and I desire to assert, with all the force and emphasis which I can command, that our faith in God and Christ and our hope of eternal life are altogether independent of such matters as these. When I feel God speaking to my soul in his Word, quickening me by his truth, and drawing me into living communion with Himself, my faith and hope are far above the region in which these controversies rage, and need fear nothing, however all these minor details of historical criticism may be settled. Is it possible that God can be less my Father and Christ my Saviour, because it may possibly be true that the Book of Daniel assigns an incorrect duration for the madness of Nebuchadnezzar, or the Book of Leviticus erroneously classes the hare among ruminant animals? Surely to state such a question is to answer it! It is deep cause for thankfulness that the Church is outgrowing the fear of science and criticism, and coming more and more to see that her faith rests on spiritual foundations which no growth of knowledge can shake. In my younger days a man was looked upon most suspiciously, and as half infidel, if he doubted that Noah's Deluge covered the whole of the globe and rose above the heights of the highest mountains. In those days a man was looked upon in the same way with deep suspicion if he hinted that possibly the ancient story of the taking of the rib out of sleeping Adam's side, to be made into a woman, might not be literal history, but a Divine allegory to set forth to a primitive age in a striking manner a deep fundamental relation between the sexes. That kind of strictness has now passed away, at least to a considerable extent, for more liberal and wider views are to be heard from the University pulpits, and in our Hulsean, Bampton, and Boyle Lectures, and are also to be read in that storehouse of conservative divinity, the *Speaker's Commentary*. Then had followed the great battle of geology, as if the foundations of Christianity could be shaken by the idea that the world might possibly have existed ages before the creation of man; but that had passed away. Still later there had been the battle over the antiquity of the human race, and some people, even to this day, argue that Christianity is imperiled by the verdict of science. But step by step we are emerging, through the good teaching of God, into a freer region of thought, and coming to see more and more the real strength of Christianity, and to feel that in whatever way the conflict over all these questions may be decided, our faith has nothing to fear. Planted on the immovable rock of God's spiritual revelation of Himself, we may calmly watch the ebb and flow of the tumult of the controversy as it rolls far beneath our feet. The key to the whole subject seems to me to be given in St. Paul's words, spoken of himself first, but applicable to all revelation—"We have this treasure in earthen vessels." Whatever comes home to our souls as Divine, quickens, regenerates, purifies, and strengthens us; that assuredly is the sacred treasure which is of God; if criticism can discover in the pages of Scripture anything besides, anything less Divine, less perfect, less true, anything that savours of human infirmity or error, we have only to remember the "earthen vessels," and smile at the folly of thinking that because they may be frail and imperfect, the treasure committed to them need be anything less than Divine.

Rev. Dr. PAYNE, R.N., Sheerness.

I STAND up at this meeting, not as an expert on this subject, but as a traveller in the Holy Land. The physical geography of the Holy Land is positive proof of the truth of Scripture. This land is the museum land of the whole world, and God selected it as the land of the Bible, for although it is of very small compass we find in it all varieties of climate, and consequently all varieties of animals and plants may live there. As an instance of this I may mention that when the Prince of Wales visited Palestine, attended by Dean Stanley, the prince gave a native chief a revolver as a present, and in return the chief gave the prince a puma, different to any known species. It was sent home, and what became of it I don't know. There is to be found on the shores of one of the lakes of Palestine a black lily, which I am assured by botanists to be a distinct kind of itself. These instances, I think, prove that the land of the Bible was selected by God as a peculiar land. Another thing which is very curious is the tomb of Rachel, which has never been disputed, and that illustrates the passage, "In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not;" and the monument is to be seen to the present day near Bethlehem. Then as to the site of Capernaum, that is fixed at different places in different maps, but no one knows the real site; and I believe that our Lord meant that the site of that city should be lost for ever. We have in this instance the fulfilment of our Lord's prophecy in the fact that the site is lost. Every one knows where Jerusalem and Tyre are, but the site of Capernaum is, as our Lord said, "cast down into hell."

Mr. WILLIAM ROWBOTTOM, of Alfreton.

MY LORD, I am not ashamed to confess my belief that the present position of this nation is due to the continued favour of God to his ancient people; but it is not on that point that I wish to address you, nor do I see why Mr. Cooper should have gone out of his way to cast a slur on a large number of believers. The subject we have met to discuss is, What definite results have been attained by the discoveries in Egypt and Assyria? I had hoped that the question of chronology, touched upon by the reader of one of the papers, would have been more largely dealt with. With regard to Egyptian history, I am assured by Dr. Birch that the first definite era established by modern research is the reign of Tirhakah. That reign must correspond in point of time with the reign of Sennacherib of Assyria, and I find that it does so correspond by the dates now determined for that monarch's reign. The reigns of these two kings must, moreover, correspond with that of Hezekiah of Judah. Now, when I turn to the Bible and compare by the dates there affixed, I find that Hezekiah had been dead some years before either of these two kings had begun to reign. Of course, the solution of this difficulty is that the Bible dates require re-adjustment. The present Bible chronology, having been compiled from incomplete materials, must be rectified by the more certain records now available. It appears to me that up to the present time biblical scholars have gone upon the principle of accommodating profane history to suit the supposed requirements of the sacred narrative; and now we are in danger of going to the opposite extreme—that the pendulum will swing back on the opposite course—that we are now in danger of having the sacred narrative broken to accommodate it to profane history. It is on this account that I venture to address you on a subject which it may appear

presumptuous in me to speak on. For I find in the most recently published history of Assyria—a book published by the Christian Knowledge Society—a flagrant instance of this nature. The dates are materially lowered at certain points, and, noticeably, at the first captivity of Judah, where the date of 690 B.C. is accepted in lieu of the much earlier date; while at the same time some of the old dates are adhered to, and in order to maintain a fictitious agreement the reigns of Menahem, Pekahiah, and Pekah are slurred over in so shameful a manner that the history of some 25 years is made to appear as though only covering some six or seven. Now, if it is necessary to lower the monarchical dates at any point to the extent of some 30 years, let us lower the dates throughout. Let us stand by those historical books which have been received by the Church—both Jewish and Christian—as a true record of the history of God's people, and let us not break the sacred narrative. The result of lowering the dates about 30 years in the reign of Hezekiah would be to bring the date of the captivity of Judah down to the year 556 B.C., when, as recorded in the last chapter of Chronicles, they were carried away to Babylon, where they were servants to the king and his sons until the reign of the kingdom of Persia; to fulfil the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah. And then, as though to carry on the record, the book of Ezra opens with a reference to the same effect. "Now, in the first year of Cyrus, king of Persia, that the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah might be fulfilled, the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus, king of Persia." Seventy years from B.C. 556 would give the year B.C. 486 as the date of the return of the Jews; and this was the first year of Xerxes, king of Persia, who would be the restorer of the Jews, the monarch styled "Cyrus the Persian;" and of this we have a corroboration in the mutilated tradition recorded by Josephus.

THE CHAIRMAN.

WE must now bring this meeting to a close. I am sure that I may rightly describe the interesting papers which we have heard as only a sample of the fruits of the promised land, just as the grapes of Eshcol were to the children of Israel. The great benefit of hearing papers of this kind is not that we shall go away with the notion that we have obtained any great amount of information upon this particularly difficult subject, but that our appetites will be stirred to study the matter at home. Everything that tends to elucidate the Word of God must be of the profoundest interest. I hope that many of you have read that remarkable book which I for one consider as among the best books of modern times, Mr. Smith's "Shipwreck of St. Paul." Everyone who has done so must have experienced a sensation of delight, which recurs every time he reads that most interesting chapter at the close of the Acts of the Apostles. But, after all, we are to bear in mind that the great purposes of God are independent of these small circumstances. If we are to wait for all points connected with Scripture history to be clearly settled, we might just as well refuse to believe that the sun shines on us and warms us until science has explained the existence of the spots on its surface. Let us remember that the great glory and interest of the books of the Old Testament is that they are not mere histories, such as have come from other pens: they are essentially inspired histories; because all the lines which come from them are concentrated upon the cradle of Christ, and find their meaning and consistency in the coming of Jesus Christ into the world.

ALBERT HALL, FRIDAY EVENING,

OCTOBER 4th, 1878.

FINAL MEETING.

THE final meeting was held in the Albert Hall during a *Conversazione*. After an excellent programme of sacred music, rendered by a large voluntary choir under the direction of Mr. T. Tallis Trimnell, Mus. Bac., Oxon. (organist of the Parish Church, Sheffield), the Archbishop and the several speakers took seats upon the platform, HIS GRACE presiding.

His Worship the MAYOR OF SHEFFIELD (Alderman F. T. Mappin).

MY LORDS, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN,—I have a pleasing duty to perform, and it is one which I am sure, after the happy week we have spent, you will heartily assist me to discharge. We are indebted very much to his Grace the Lord Archbishop for arranging this Church Congress to be held in Sheffield. We are indebted to his Grace still more for the advice and assistance he has given to the committee and to those upon whom the management of affairs devolved; and also for the time he has devoted to those labours, and for the number of meetings he has attended, he deserves our most sincere and hearty thanks. His Grace is always ready to come amongst us, and the great services he is ever rendering us we must all admit. He gave last night to one of the largest meetings I ever saw, and which is admitted to have been one of the grandest sights of the kind we ever had in Sheffield, a splendid oration which gladdened the hearts of all Churchmen. I have the greatest pleasure in proposing the following resolution:—"That the respectful and hearty thanks of the Church Congress be tendered to his

Grace the Lord Archbishop of York for his able, genial, and impartial conduct as President."

The resolution was then put to the meeting and carried by acclamation.

The Right Hon. and Most Rev. the PRESIDENT.

MR. MAYOR, MY LORDS, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN,—I am very much gratified by this resolution, because, as you may suppose, when a bishop comes forward in these times to take the helm at a Church Congress, he knows very well the kind of dangers he has to encounter and the risks that are to be run. I think that, upon the whole, we have avoided most of the dangers and risks. Of course we shall not satisfy everybody. There is an old maxim well-known to all Churchmen—*Nil sine episcopo*, "do nothing without the bishop," and the Congress always has a bishop at its head. But there is a knot of people in the present day who construe it, "Do nothing without a shot at the bishop;" and they are the very people who are always arguing for an increase of the episcopate. I should say that if we are to be shot at, the smaller the point we present to the enemy the better. We shall not satisfy them; but I do confess to a great secret satisfaction in seeing this Congress come to an end, and in being assured on all hands that, upon the whole, people have been gratified by its tone and temper, and that they have gone away with something to remember and something to dwell on for the rest of the year. As for that meeting last night, however long I may live, and whatever I may have to go through, I promise you I will never forget it. To see 4000 or more of the real working-men of Sheffield, at the close of a four hours' sitting ready to appreciate the most obscure argument, to catch the slightest turn, to interpret the merest approach to a jest; to note the temper and order of the whole meeting, was a pleasure that no indifferent spectator could possibly forget. But I am not an indifferent spectator. I value more deeply than I can tell you—I shall cherish as long as I live—the kind of relation that has sprung up, I know not how—partly I think through the work of friends in this place and not by anything I have done—between the working-men of Sheffield and myself. But this is not a personal question. The fact is that the Church of England has been a conception in the minds of Sheffield working-men, till lately, of a very different kind from what we should like. I do not think they supposed that an archbishop could walk—I know they thought he could not talk; and as to the clergy, there was a general impression that people not quite strong enough to wield a hammer or unable to

make a pair of scissors or a razor, were put into snug berths, there to do nothing for the rest of their lives. Now I congratulate the clergy, on having undone that conception altogether. There is an end of it ; and it will not be heard of again in this place. We now stand before the people in a different light. When I say "we," I mean the whole of the clergy who have taken part in this movement, for those who have witnessed it are sure to go away impressed with the fact that the clergy at large are not mere dummies, but that they are leaders of thought, and fit to take their places in the van in a great country, where all men are thinking, and where classes which thought not before are now beginning to think, and think deeply. From my heart, I thank you for the reception you have given me. I cannot say I am astonished at it, for that would be ungrateful, as I have often been here in the past ; but I thank you from my heart for the way in which these great meetings have been conducted by everybody. I suppose it will be the subject of a separate vote, but I may say the great and splendid hospitalities of this town which have been extended to so many will give a most favourable impression to all those who have witnessed it or have partaken of it in any way. It is also most gratifying to learn that members of other communities outside the Church have thrown open their hospitable doors and welcomed the members of the Congress who have visited the town. Now I feel that I have said all that words can say, but there is something left which words cannot say. The great journal, the *Times*, that sniffs a little at us, you know, says that the Archbishop of York will be sure to make the best of things and to overlook the dangers. Well, if I have done the latter I have belied my own thoughts and my own convictions ; for the dangers and troubles of the Church are upon my mind, and upon all our minds, every day of our lives. I did not, however, expect to preside over an assembly of several thousand people, and get them all to work in harmony by whining over our troubles ; but that does not prevent our feeling them all the same. What I say is this, that God in this mixed life of ours gives us something to suffer and something to enjoy. The suffering comes to us from the troubles of the Church, and the present sin and ignorance wherewith we have to cope, but for which we find ourselves sadly unequal. The comfort and the pleasure come from meetings of this kind, where there is an interchange of loving intercourse, and every one goes away feeling that instead of having lost an opportunity he has knit tighter and closer those ties of love which are the sure passports to any doing of good. I would not for my part surrender that thought, happy and cheering as it is, for anything that could be offered to me. Now, instead of detaining you longer, I will simply say I heartily thank the

Mayor and the whole town of Sheffield for their reception of me, and for the entertainment they have given this Congress.

The Right Rev. R. MACHRAY, D.D., Lord Bishop of
Rupert's Land.

I HAVE undertaken in a few words to execute the pleasant duty of proposing a vote of thanks, into the spirit of which I thoroughly enter, and which I am certain will be warmly and heartily adopted: it is—"That the readers and speakers be requested to accept the sincere thanks of the Congress for their admirable contributions, and for the straightforward yet loving way in which they enunciated their views." I had the pleasure of being present at the infant Congress—the first of the series—which was held in the hall of King's College, Cambridge. I had also the pleasure of attending the Congress at Nottingham, when I was in this country seven years since, and it is gratifying to me to observe the large proportions to which the movement has grown. I regret to find that some of my evangelical friends have not seen their way to be with us on this occasion. My own views are distinctly evangelical, and as years go on I feel more and more devoted to them; but I never have pursued a course of isolation. I am sure that such a course is not one which will maintain or forward the views we cherish. My great regret at these Congresses is, that from the want of a power of popular address, I have not been able to advocate as I could wish, the views I so thoroughly hold and entertain. I feel certain of this, that when we attend Congresses carried on in a proper spirit, as this has so pre-eminently been, they must greatly help us in having a due regard and sympathy for others, which must powerfully aid our own spiritual life. I can assure you, my lord Archbishop, and this assembly, that, as a bishop who is spending his time in another part of the world, I feel very thankful for what I have heard at the several meetings of this Congress. It was a sincere pleasure to me, and to many friends holding my views, present at the Lambeth Conferences, to observe the substantial unity which prevailed on all essential points. I think that that has been a particularly marked feature of this Congress. It has been a great delight to me to observe how the great essentials of the faith—what we all feel to be essentials—have been made prominent, and the smaller peculiarities have been thrown into the background. At such a Congress everything depends upon the speakers. It is a great opportunity; but whether it may prove a blessing rests with the wisdom and discretion

of those who take the position of speakers. I think we have been admirably served in that respect on the present occasion. We cannot too heartily echo the words of the resolution, and admire the straightforward and loving way in which the papers placed before us have been drawn up. The various papers read to us, and the speeches that were made, had been carefully prepared. They expressed heartily and truthfully what the speakers felt, and at the same time everything was delivered in the most kind and loving way. I think in passing this vote special thanks should be given to those who spoke at that large and remarkable meeting yesterday. I do not think any one present can ever forget it. We must all feel that such a meeting is a great opportunity: and such a success should secure a continued place for it in the programme of Church Congresses. At the same time everything will depend upon the selection of the speakers, who must be men of power in speaking, and men of discretion.

The resolution was then put by the Archbishop and carried unanimously.

THE LORD BISHOP OF CARLISLE.

I HAVE to express to you the feelings which animate the hearts of the readers of papers and the speakers during this Congress, with regard to the vote you have just been so kind as to pass. I trust the fact of my having been called upon to acknowledge this vote of thanks may be regarded as showing that my own contributions were of a very slight and comparatively unimportant character. Had I contributed one of those admirable papers which have been read to us, or had I been conscious of having taken any serious part in this important Congress, my modesty would have prevented me from accepting the position I now occupy. But having throughout the Congress been more of a looker-on and an observer than one who has taken a prominent place in the work, I entirely agree with the resolution that the papers which have been read have been straightforward and loving in their tone:—certainly some of the papers were as straightforward as anything I ever heard in my life. They were also loving; and there has, on the whole, been nothing to regret in what we have heard in these halls. On the other hand there is everything to be thankful for in the spirit which has animated our meetings, in the manner in which people of different schools of thought have boldly, and without any reticence, expressed their own views, as well as the manner in which they have been listened to. I feel that to acknowledge a vote of thanks on the part of such a body, having your grace at its head, is a serious responsibility; but

I am sure that if you are satisfied with the manner in which the papers have been composed and the speeches have been made, we have every reason to be pleased with the hearty vote of thanks given to us ; and we shall go away from Sheffield grateful to you and to the people of this great town. Having mentioned this town, allow me to digress for a moment from my immediate subject, because I feel it would be absolutely impossible to leave Sheffield without saying what a deep impression has been produced on my mind by the kindly,—nay, the noble, magnificent, and liberal hospitality which has been extended to us. Everything has been done to make our visit agreeable and pleasant, and to show that the people of Sheffield have had a sincere interest in this Congress and the work it has had in hand. They have shown that they have warm, and I may say, good, open Yorkshire hearts, and they have received us, not as a matter of form, but as if they were really glad to see us, from the Mayor of Sheffield down to—I don't know how low, but certainly far below the level of the house in which it has been my privilege to be entertained. Reference has been made by your grace and by the Bishop of Rupert's Land to the scene which was witnessed in this hall last night. I cannot pass over that subject without expressing my entire agreement in, and sympathy with your grace's words respecting that most remarkable meeting. I never saw a more magnificent assembly in my life. In the first place it was manifestly a genuine thing—there was no sham or deceit about it. The men clearly were working men ; and they were exactly the class it was intended to bring together, and exactly the class to which we intended to address ourselves. I was also struck very much by the quality of mind which was exhibited by the men. They were not mere masses of steel-working flesh and blood ; it was quite manifest that they had a good development of brain, and that they perfectly understood what was said to them. I watched them while his grace delivered that remarkable speech, and I could not help noticing the manner in which the men responded, and how every point—and there were a great many points in that speech—was taken. It was like a man playing on an instrument and knowing exactly what chords to touch, the sound answering to his fingers in such a way as to show the complete accord between himself and the instrument. For the rest of my life I shall have deeply implanted in my memory the recollection of that wonderful meeting, which I look upon as a grand opportunity given to two or three of us, in the providence of God, of speaking to working-men on behalf of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, and of that Church of which we are ministers. I could not help being struck also with the Church feeling manifested by those men. I came to speak to

them, I confess, with some notion that they would be men who regarded the Church as something outside them, something in which they had no particular interest, something which they would not care to hear much about, something which might perhaps be tolerable when dished up by an archbishop and two or three bishops, but something, nevertheless, in which they had no hearty interest. I found I was monstrously mistaken. When I spoke to them as *Churchmen*, and of the importance of preserving the Church of England amongst us, and of the folly of attempting to overthrow it without considering the loss or gain to the country of such a step—when I asked them to reflect what the loss would be if the Church were taken away, and they were deprived of their ministers, their free and open churches, and of all the benefits of the parochial system, I found I had touched a chord which vibrated throughout the hall, and I felt that I was in the midst of a large number of not merely Sheffield men, but Sheffield Churchmen. My excuse for alluding to this subject—and if I have erred I beg pardon—is that my feelings were too strong to allow me to pass it by. I could not leave the town without expressing in these few words the deep and permanent effect produced on my mind by the magnificent scene exhibited in this hall last evening. And now on behalf of his Grace the Lord Archbishop, who has been one of our speakers, on behalf of all the readers of papers, some of whom are upon the platform, and on behalf of all the speakers of all kinds, whether those who were appointed by the committee or those who came bravely forward, notwithstanding the penal enactment of that terrible bell, to assist in our discussions, I beg leave to return you our sincere and hearty thanks, and to assure you that we shall all remember to our dying days our pleasant visit to Sheffield.

The Right Hon. the Earl NELSON.

MY LORD ARCHBISHOP, MY LORDS, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN,—I have been asked to propose:—"That the grateful thanks of the Congress be presented to the town of Sheffield and the neighbourhood for the generous encouragement and hospitality extended to its members." But I wish to include in this resolution our special thanks to the Mayor, who not only was one of the first to come boldly forward with the guarantee fund, but has shewn a deep interest in the Congress from the very beginning, and has actually done us the kindness of reading a paper himself at one of our meetings. I have also to include thanks to the Master Cutler, and to all the

inhabitants of the town and neighbourhood of Sheffield. I am glad to know that I may include in these thanks Roman Catholics and Protestant Nonconformists as well as Churchmen, who liberally came forward to welcome and entertain those coming from a distance to attend this Congress. I also wish to include in this resolution our thanks to the artisans and working-men of Sheffield for having so heartily welcomed us by accepting in such overwhelming numbers the invitation of the Congress to this hall to hear some of the speakers. All I can say, and I speak from personal experience, which I believe is the experience of all the members, that we have received much benefit from our residence here. We have witnessed the practical proof of your great hospitality ; we have been refreshed by the noble generosity shewn by those who, having been blessed by God, have been moved to give freely of their great wealth, and many of us have met with a straightforward reality of character which is not so common as it should be in the land. I hope, too, that the inhabitants of this town have received some benefit from the discussions at the Congress, and from our short residence amongst them, and that we shall part as friends who will not readily forget each other. I beg to couple with the resolution the names of the Mayor of Sheffield, Mr. Mark Firth (my own kind host), and the Vicar of Sheffield.

Rev. Canon RYLE.

WE have had so much speaking this week that you will not expect a long speech from me ; but I have great pleasure in seconding the resolution which my friend Lord Nelson has proposed. He and I do not always agree upon Church matters ; although we are both in the same ship we do not always pull in the same boat. The noble earl however knows perfectly well that I respect him and his opinions, and I believe he respects me and my opinions. But there is one point on which we are thoroughly agreed, and that is the resolution which he has moved and I now second. We live in the days of "limited companies ;" but there has been no limitation this week—the hospitality we have received has been unlimited : people often mean well, but with good intentions there is not always successful performance. In Sheffield, however, the people had not only good intentions, but their performances have exceeded their intentions ; and we all heartily thank them for what they have done. I have been to many Congresses, and on the whole I think this has been a very successful one indeed. I never go to a Congress expecting to have my own way. I see a good many things I do not like to see,

and hear a good many things I do not like to hear ; but I regard that as a kind of medicine which may do me good afterwards. In fact I might compare Congress to the ships which King Solomon sent to Tarshish, which brought back not only gold and silver and ivory, but apes and peacocks too. Of course the application I leave to you. I do not say who are the apes and the peacocks, or who are the gold and the silver. I expect a medley when I go to a Congress, and a medley we have had this week ; but I have no doubt we have done right in coming. Some time ago I ventured to put forth a small pamphlet on the subject, with three little words for a title—" Shall we go ? " and one of my evangelical brethren who did not agree with me wrote another pamphlet with a shorter title—" No ! " I am sorry he and his companions have not been here this week, as I am sure it would have done them a great deal of good. For myself, I shall go home feeling a great deal better for coming to Sheffield. I was born north of the Trent, and though I am located in a rural district of Suffolk, I am well acquainted with the long tall chimneys of Yorkshire, and its hearty, straightforward, hospitable people. I have no doubt about the Church-feeling of Yorkshire, and I felt quite confident as to the reception the Congress would get on coming to Sheffield. No one could doubt the reality of the Church's work in our large towns who saw that magnificent meeting of the working-men in this hall last night. I never saw an audience more intelligent, or more responsive with regard to the question of disestablishment, as explained to them. I shall go home with a better heart than I ever had before about the Church of England, and with a firm conviction that so long as she has archbishops like the Archbishop of York, and bishops and clergy who will come forward and speak out all their minds face to face, and tell the laity that they want to keep the Church as she is, Scriptural and Protestant, and that they do not want the Church of England to go back to Rome, she is in no danger whatever.

The resolution was then carried unanimously.

His Worship the MAYOR OF SHEFFIELD.

MY LORD ARCHBISHOP, MY LORDS, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN,—We are very pleased indeed that the members of the Congress are satisfied with what has been done during the week, and I am sure my townsmen will be highly gratified to hear the remarks that have been made in praise of their hospitality. For myself, I must say that I am very proud of the way in which my townsmen have re-

ceived the Church Congress. It has been most creditable to them ; and I regret that some of our clerical friends should have expressed doubts as to the Congress coming here. Their fears have turned out to be unfounded, and their opinions must have undergone a change, as I have seen many of the objectors present at our meetings. They might have been sure that the Archbishop would not have proposed to hold the Congress at Sheffield if he had feared that any ill results would take place. On behalf of my fellow-townsmen and townswomen I thank you very much for the resolution you have so heartily passed.

MR. MARK FIRTH, Sheffield.

HAVING been appointed to acknowledge the resolution just passed, I would remark that if in the North of England the people are noted for being blunt, outspoken, and straightforward, they are equally noted for hospitality ; and I can assure the Congress that the inhabitants of Sheffield who have opened their houses—and they are many—to receive the members, have done so with right good will ; and they are exceedingly glad that the Congress is satisfied with the manner in which it has been treated. With regard to this great and important gathering, I cannot conceive that so many men of ability, of character, of learning, of earnestness, and of zeal for the cause of God could assemble and take counsel together, and hold so many meetings, without good results. The clergy of the Church of England are as honest, as hard-working, and as zealous a class of labourers as any in existence : I can say the same of the ministers of many Dissenting bodies ; and all are working for one great object, the good of mankind and the glory of God. The proceedings of this week have been, I believe, eminently calculated to further that great and holy purpose. I entirely agree with those who have remarked with respect to the meeting of last night, that there never was a more important, enthusiastic, and interesting gathering ; but I should like to inform our friends here who are not resident in Sheffield, that we have had not unfrequently in this hall as many as three thousand working men listening with the greatest interest, earnestness, and attention to scientific lectures. You will therefore see that the working men of Sheffield take an interest in all that goes on in the world with respect to science, politics, and religion ; and I hope that great good will result from the meeting of last night, and from all the meetings which have taken place this week.

Rev. Canon BLAKENEY, Vicar of Sheffield.

MY LORD ARCHBISHOP, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN,—I have also been requested to acknowledge the resolution which has just been proposed, but it would be superfluous to add anything to the admirable remarks which have been made by his Worshipful the Mayor and Mr. Mark Firth. I would merely say I had from the beginning no doubt as to the hospitality of the people of Sheffield. There were some misgivings in the minds of many, when they heard that from two to three thousand people were likely to come to the town, and the questions were repeatedly asked, "Where shall we find hospitality for so large a number?" "Where shall we find beds?" My reply was, "Only wait until the time arrives, and you will see that the people of Sheffield will be equal to the occasion." The result has proved that I was right. When I entered the room this evening I was addressed by a clergyman who said that he should very much like to thank the inhabitants of this town for the princely hospitality they had shown to so many strangers, and he added, "I have now been to ten Church Congresses, and I have been hospitably entertained at all of them, but on none of these occasions did I receive a donation of £10 from my host, for the work of my parish, until I came to Sheffield."

In the name of the people of Sheffield, I also beg to thank you very heartily for the vote of thanks which has been carried with such acclamation.

**Rev. Canon WILKINSON, D.D., Rector of St. Martin's,
Birmingham.**

MY LORD ARCHBISHOP, MY LORDS, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN,—I feel myself almost a Sheffield man again: for having spent fifteen years—and happy years—of my life in this place, to come back and see so many old friends makes me feel as one of them. I rejoice greatly at the praises bestowed upon the good old town; but I had no fears as to the hospitality of its people. I have now the pleasing duty to perform of proposing the following resolution:—"That the warmest thanks of all members of the Congress are due to the committee for the successful manner in which they have completed their arduous undertaking." No one who knows anything of the work of getting up a Congress can doubt for a moment that the expression in

the resolution, "arduous undertaking," is a term fitly applied to those incessant labours; for what has been done this week is only a small matter compared with the preliminary work: this week they may be said to have been enjoying themselves. But the committee have really been working for us, not for weeks, but for months gone by. Some of the gentlemen included in the resolution are old friends of mine. I knew them in their youth, and I rejoice to see them in their manhood, occupying important positions in the town, and fulfilling the duties assigned to them in so admirable a manner. It has been most gratifying to me to see the able manner in which our friend Mr. Wright has performed his duties. No doubt he has admirable colleagues; but he has done much and has done it well, as one of the honorary secretaries. I knew Mr. Wright in his youth, and was associated with him in Sunday-school work, and I rejoice to know that he is now a faithful and excellent minister of God's word in this town. The committee have done their work well, and I consider it a high honour to propose, by this resolution, a recognition of their valuable services.

The resolution having been put was carried by acclamation.

Rev. C. SISUM WRIGHT, Vicar of St. Silas', Sheffield, and one
of the Local Hon. Secretaries to the Congress.

I HAVE the honour to be called upon to respond to the resolution on behalf of the committee and of my brother secretaries, and to acknowledge the kind manner in which it has been passed. It would be idle to deny that our labours have been heavy. They have been heavy, but they have been most cheerfully performed. For my brother secretaries and myself, I must say that our labours have been rendered extremely pleasant by the kindness, forbearance, and courtesy of the committee with whom we have worked. After eleven months of anxious toil, during which we have had many meetings, and some of them protracted for as much as seven hours, it is something to be able to say that they were never disturbed by one word of discord or one jarring note. Indeed, so pleasant have been our meetings that it is almost a subject of regret to find they are now drawing to a close. I am sure my brother secretaries will find fault with me if I sit down without mentioning the name of one to whose wise counsels and unceasing interest in the Congress so much of its success is due—I mean our beloved Vicar of Sheffield. I remember, too, that I have again to meet the committee, and I

am sure I shall be called to account by that body if I omit to express their grateful sense of the unceasing interest and kind advice of his Grace the President. I am in a position to know that his Grace came often to the town to attend meetings of the committee at great personal inconvenience; and it is only right that at this meeting we should acknowledge the valuable services of the archbishop. Allusion has been made to the fact, and it is true, that at one time there were some who were afraid to have the Congress at Sheffield; but when I had the privilege last night to stand on this platform and see the thousands of horny-handed artisans and working-men of my native town who composed that great meeting, I felt that if we had done nothing more by bringing the Congress to Sheffield than the assembling of that vast audience to hear the addresses that were given, it was something for which we ought to thank God. But is that the limit of the good of this Congress? Surely not. I believe the result will be greater activity of the Church's life, and a great increase in works of piety and usefulness for the sake and for the glory of God in this busy centre of commercial industry. I conclude by saying that the committee, my brother secretaries, and myself, will long cherish in our memories your kind appreciation of our humble services.

The Right Hon. and Most Rev. the PRESIDENT.

THERE is one other duty that I wish to perform myself. We have acknowledged in a very hearty way the services of most of those who have assisted in the work of the Congress, and I think we are also very much indebted to Mr. Trimnell, the organist of the Parish Church, for the musical arrangements. I need not remind you of the magnificent musical service with which we opened our meetings, and we are also indebted to Mr. Trimnell for having given much time and attention to the preparation of the music sung to-night by the admirable volunteer choir. I therefore propose a vote of thanks to Mr. Trimnell, as an artist and as a churchman.

The Venerable Archdeacon EMERY, Permanent Secretary
to the Church Congress.

I HAVE an official declaration to make. The consultative committee have met, and after great deliberation on two days, have decided to accept for next year's Congress, the invitation of SWANSEA. The

bishop of the diocese, the magistrates, and all the authorities of that place, and of six counties around are anxious to receive us. We had also a hearty invitation from Carnarvon, but the committee felt that in the interests of the Church we ought to go next year to Swansea. I should like, on my own behalf, to thank the mayor, the vicar, the clergy, and the laity of Sheffield, for the energy, generosity, and earnestness they have manifested in arranging for this Congress. I can assure you that, as permanent secretary, I received two or three very curious letters against the desirableness of coming to Sheffield. In consequence of those letters I decided to meet the committee, as I always find personal intercourse the best means of rubbing off corners. I must say that I came down with some little trepidation ; but the result was that I never went to a more harmonious meeting. When I thought of all that was said, and the enthusiasm, the kindness, the lovingness of all present, and then remembered the letters I had received, I came to the conclusion that there were some very peculiar people in the world ; but they did not reside at Sheffield. I have, as the representative of the Church Congress generally, to thank the press. One of the great objects of these Congresses is to educate and inform the public mind, and to bring the Church of England in all its departments of thought and work fully before the nation. A very large number of churchmen and churchwomen cannot attend the Congresses. Unless, then, the press fully represented, as it does, our proceedings, the result we aim at would not be attained. I always find the press most anxious to give full reports, and although it does from time to time comment on and criticise our proceedings, it does so on the whole in a kindly, Christian spirit. I am deeply thankful to your grace for assuring us, as against other places which invited us, that if we came to Sheffield we should find that it was the right place to come to. Your grace's wisdom and prescience have been fully justified by the event. I also heartily thank God for the great good which I am persuaded will be done through the people of Sheffield, not only to our beloved Church of England, in uniting more nearly all sections of thought within her pale, but by inducing those without the Church to regard us with greater toleration and respect.

The Right Hon. the Earl NELSON.

I WILL only detain the meeting for a moment or two more, but I have to make a short statement on a matter of business. At the Church Congress at Plymouth, a vote of thanks and congratulation

was passed to Archdeacon Emery, who had at that time been saved unhurt in a serious accident. The members of the Congress on that occasion presented him with a purse and a hundred guineas, requesting the archdeacon to give it to any Church work he might select. His modesty has hitherto prevented him from telling us what to do with it; but he has now expressed a wish that the Bishop of Carlisle and myself should decide how that hundred guineas was to be spent. I have to announce our award. It is that, inasmuch as the archdeacon has been carrying out great improvements in the church at Haddenham, in the Isle of Ely, which living is in his gift as archdeacon, and there is still a debt on the church, which has been admirably restored, and the tower, which had fallen down, rebuilt; the hundred guineas shall go towards the reduction of that debt.

The remainder of the musical programme was then gone through, and was concluded by the choral hymn, "Through the day thy love has spared us," &c., and Handel's Hallelujah Chorus.

The Right Hon. and Most Rev. the PRESIDENT then pronounced the apostolic benediction, and the Congress terminated.

THE END.

SHEFFIELD:
PAWSON AND BRAILSFORD, PRINTERS, BRITANNIA PRINTING WORKS,
MULBERRY STREET.

GTU Library



3 2400 00670 4906

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500,
All items are subject to recall

